

BACONIANA.

VOL. IX. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1911.

No. 34.

THE MYSTERY OF FRANCIS BACON.

(Continuation).

WHAT was this rare and unaccustomed suit of which the Queen could have had no experience and which, according to Spedding, would make it unnecessary for Bacon to follow "ordinary practice at the bar"? The false historians and biographers have founded on this suit the allegation that from his earliest years Bacon was a place hunter, entirely ignoring the fact, which is made clear from the letter to Walsingham written four years after the application was first made, that he had resolved on a course of action which, if her Majesty liked not his suit, by the leave of God he must and would follow, not for any necessity of estate, but for his credit sake. Here was a young man of twenty years of age, earnestly urging the adoption of a scheme which he had conceived, and which he feared Burghley might consider indiscreet and inadvised. Failing in obtaining his object, as will be proved by definite evidence, undertaking at the cost of Thomas Bodley and his other friends a course of travel to better fit him for the task he had mapped out as his life's work—returning to England and, four years after his first request had been made, renewing his suit

—grimly in earnest and determined to carry the scheme through at all costs, with or without the Queen's aid—this is not the conduct of a mere place hunter. If these letters be read aright and the reasonable theory which will be advanced of the nature of the suit be accepted—all efforts to suggest any explanation having hitherto, as Spedding admits, proved futile—a fresh light will be thrown upon the character of Francis Bacon, and the heavy obligation under which he has placed his countrymen for all ages will for the first time be recognised.

In the seven volumes of Bacon's Life and Letters there is nothing to justify the eulogy on his character to which Spedding gave utterance in the following words:—“But in him the gift of seeing in prophetic vision what might be and ought to be was united with the practical talent of devising means and handling minute details. He could at once imagine like a poet and execute like a clerk of the works. Upon the conviction *This must be done* followed at once *How* may it be done? Upon that question answered followed the resolution to try and do it.” More than that, the actual achievement followed with unerring certainty, but Spedding restricts Bacon's life's work to the establishment of a system of inductive philosophy and records the failure of the system.

The first stage in the investigation is to get some definite idea of the proficiency in learning of young Francis when he embarked with Sir Amias Paulet on his first momentous journey to France in 1576.

There is evidence which may help the investigator to form an opinion as to what was probably the minimum of Bacon's acquirements at these stages. In the short Life of himself which Thomas Bodley left he makes the following statement as to how far his education had

advanced when his father decided to fix his abode in the City of Geneva in 1556.

I was at that time of twelve yeares age but through my fathers cost and care sufficiently instructed to become an Auditour of *Chevalerius* in Hebrew, of *Bercaldus* in Greeke, of *Calvin* and *Beza* in Divinity and of some other Professours in that University, (which was newly there erected) besides my domesticall teachers, in the house of *Philibertus Saracenus*, a famous Physitian in that City, with whom I was boarded; when *Robertus Constantinus*, that made the Greeke *Lexicon* read *Homer* unto me.

At this time Bodley was of the same age as was Francis Bacon when he entered Cambridge, and it is a fair presumption that the latter would not be less advanced.

As to what his acquirements may have been when he arrived in France we can gather from what, on fairly reliable authority, we know to have been those of another of his contemporaries. So much romance has been thrown around James Crichton that it is difficult to obtain the real facts of his life. Sir Thomas Urquhart in "Discovery of a Most Exquisite Jewel," published in 1652, gives a biography which is, without doubt, mainly apocryphal. Certain facts, however, are well established. He was born in the same year as was Bacon—1560. At 10 years of age he entered St. Andrew's University, and in 1575 (the year Bacon left Cambridge) took his degree, coming out third in the first class. In 1576 he went to France, as did Bacon—to Paris and to Navarre. In the college of the latter he issued a universal challenge; that is, to all men, upon all things, in any of twelve languages named. The challenge is broad and formal. He pledged himself to review the schoolmen, allowed his opponents the privilege of selecting their topics—mathematics, no less than scholastic lore—either from branches publicly or privately taught, and promised to return answers in

logical figure or in numbers estimated according to their occult power, or in any of a hundred sorts of verse. He is said to have justified before many competent witnesses his magnificent pretensions.

Such was Bacon's contemporary. When it is remembered that within eighteen months an artist when painting Bacon's portrait inscribed around it—to quote Spedding—the significant words, the natural ejaculation of his own emotion, “*Si tabula daretur digna, animum mallet,*” such, too, may have been Francis Bacon.

The point here made is this: What Bodley was at twelve Bacon probably was. A far less state of development than Crichton had arrived at when 16 or 17 years of age would be sufficient to justify the possibility of Bacon achieving at a corresponding age what will be attributed to him.

The chief feature of such culture as existed in England was the cultivation of the French language. As early as 1521 Alexander Barclay had compiled a French-English grammar. Giles Dewes, who was brought to England to teach French to Henry VIII., subsequently in 1528 wrote for the benefit of the Princess Mary an *Introductorie for to learn to rede, to pronounce and to speak French trewly*. John Palsgrave, an Englishman educated in Paris, but whose life was afterwards spent in England, was tutor to many young Englishmen of birth. He wrote for his pupils “*L'Esclaircissement de la langue francoyse*,” a bulky volume in which the idiom and grammatic structure of the two languages are compared. So original was his work that he is said to have supplied the French people with rules for their own language. There were in England, therefore, facilities for acquiring proficiency in the French language; it was the language used in Court circles. At Geneva, when Bodley attended Calvin's lectures, he listened to a man whose French prose was for clearness and sim-

plicity unsurpassed. Beza, another of his lecturers, was a Frenchman who wrote dramas. His prose writings, except his "*Historie des Eglises Réformées*," were in Latin. Crichton's knowledge of French must have been all that could have been desired, having regard to his challenge to the college of Navarre. It is reasonable, therefore, to insist that in 1576 Francis Bacon was proficient in the French language.

A further suggestion is put forward with all diffidence, but after long and careful investigation. Francis Bacon was the author of two books which were published, one before he left England and the other shortly after. The first is a philosophical discourse entitled "*The Anatomie of the Minde*." Newlie made and set forth by T. R. Imprinted at London by I. C. for Andrew Mannsell, 1576, 12mo. The dedication is addressed to Master Christopher Hatton, and the name of Tho. Rogers is attached to it. There was a Thomas Rogers who was Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, and the book has been attributed to him, apparently only because no other of the same name was known. There was published in 1577 a translation by Rogers of a Latin book "*Of the Ende of the World, etc.*," and there are other translations by him published between then and 1628. There are two or three sermons, also, but the style of these, the matter, and the manner of treatment are quite distinct from those of the book under consideration. There is nothing of his which would support the assignment to him of "*The Anatomie of the Mind*." It is foreign to his style. Bearing in mind the testimony of the author of "*The Arte of English Poesie*" and the letter of Henry Cuffe, the confidant of Essex, to "Good Mr. Reynoldes," written on the return of the former to England after the engagement at Cadiz,* and

* "*Hidden Signatures of Francesco Colonna and Francis Bacon*," by W. Stone Booth, Constable & Co., Limited (1910).

the acknowledged custom of the times of putting names other than the author's on title-pages, there is no need for any apology for expressing doubt as to whether the book has been correctly placed to the credit of the Bishop Bancroft's Chaplain. In the address *To the Reader* the author says, "I dyd once for my profite in the Universitie, draw into Latin tables, which since for thy profite (Christian Reader) at the request of a gentleman of good credite and worship, I have Englished and published in these two books." There is in existence a copy of the book with printer's and other errors corrected in Bacon's own handwriting.

Bearing date 1577, imprinted at London for Henri Cockyn, is an octavo book styled "*Beautiful Blossoms*" gathered by John Byshop from the best trees of all kyndes, Divine, Philosophicall, Astronomicall, Cosmographical, Historical and Humane that are growing in Greece, Latium, and Arabia, and some also in vulgar orchards as wel fro these that in auncient time were grafted, as also from them which with skilful head and hand beene of late yeare's, yea, and in our dayes planted : to the unspeakable, both pleasure and profite of all such as wil vouchsafe to use them. On the title-page are the words "The First Tome," but no further volume was published. As to who or what John Byshop was there is no information available. His name appears on no other book. It is impracticable here to give the grounds upon which it is believed that Francis Bacon was the author of these two books. Each of them is an outpouring of classical lore and is evidently written by some young man who had recently assimilated the writings of nearly every classical author. In this respect both correspond with the manner of "*The French Academie*,"* whilst in "*The Anatomie of the Minde*" the

* "In the "*Gesta Grayorum*" one of the articles which the Knights of the Helmet were required to vow to keep, each kiss-

treatment of the subject is identical with that of the latter. Failing actual proof, the circumstantial evidence that the three books are from the same pen is almost as strong as needs be.

This, then, was the brilliant young scholar who landed with Sir Amias Paulet at Calais on the 25th of September, 1575, and with him went straight to the Court of Henry III. of France. It is a remarkable fact that neither Montague, Spedding, Hepworth Dixon nor any other biographer seems to have thought it worth while to consider under what influences he was brought when he arrived there at the most impressionable period of his life. Hepworth Dixon, without stating his authority, says that he "quits the galleries of the Louvre and St. Cloud with his morals pure," but nothing more. And yet Francis Bacon arrived in France at the most momentous epoch in the history of French literature. This boy, with his marvellous intellect—the same intellect which nearly half a century later produced the "Novum Organum"—with a memory saturated with the writings of the classical authors, and skilled in the teachings of the philosophers, with independence of thought and a courage which enabled him to condemn the methods of instruction at the University where he had spent three years in study; this boy who had a "beam of knowledge derived from God" upon him, who "had not his knowledge from books but from some grounds and notions from himself," and above and beyond all who was conscious of his powers and had unbounded

ing his helmet as he took his vow, was: "Item—Every Knight of this Order shall endeavour to add conference and experiment to reading; and therefore shall not only read and peruse 'Guizo,' 'The French Academy,' 'Galiatto the Courtier,' 'Plutarch,' 'The Arcadia,' and the Neoterical writers from time to time," etc. ("The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth." Nichols. 1788).

confidence in his capacity for using them ; this boy walked beside the English Ambassador elect into the highest circles of French Society at the time when the most important factors of influence were Ronsard and his confrères of the Pléiade. He had left behind him in his native country a language crude and almost barbaric, incapable of giving expression to the knowledge which he possessed and the thoughts which resulted therefrom.

At this time Francis Bacon thought in Latin, for his mother tongue was wholly insufficient. There is abundant proof of this in his own handwriting. Under such conditions there could be no English literature worthy of the name. If a Gentleman of the Court wrote he either suppressed his writings or suffered them to be published without his name to them, as it was a discredit for a gentleman to seem learned and to show himself amorous of any good art. Here is where Spedding missed his way and never recovered himself. Deep as is the debt of gratitude due to him for his devoted labours in the preparation of "Bacon's Life and Letters" and in the edition of his works, it must be asserted that he accomplished this work without seeing Francis Bacon. Had he done so he could not have written of him—"So situated it must have been as difficult for a young susceptible imagination not to aspire after civil dignities, as for a boy bred in camps not to long to be a soldier." There was a vista before young Bacon's eyes from which the practice of the law and civil dignities were absent, and he arrived at the French Court at the psychological moment when an object-lesson met his eyes which had a more far-reaching effect on the language and literature of the Anglo-Saxon race than any or all other influences that have conspired to raise them to the proud position which to-day they occupy. It is necessary briefly to explain the position of the French language and literature at this juncture.

The French Renaissance of literature had its beginning in the early years of the sixteenth century. It had been preceded by that of Italy, which opened in the fourteenth century, and reached its limit with Ariosto and Tasso, Macchiavelli and Guicciardini during the sixteenth century. Towards the end of the fifteenth century modern French poetry may be said to have had its origin in Villon and French prose in Comines. The style of the former was artificial and his poems abounded in recurrent rhymes and refrains. The latter had peculiarities of diction which were only compensated by the weight of thought and simplicity of expression. Clement Marot, who followed, stands out as one of the first landmarks in the French Renaissance. His graceful style, free from stiffness and monotony, earned for him a popularity which even the brilliancy of the *Pléiade* did not extinguish, for he continued to be read with genuine admiration for nearly two centuries. He was the founder of a school of which Mellia de St. Gelais, the introducer of the sonnet into France, was the most important member. In fiction Rabelais and his followers concurrently effected a complete revolution. Marguerite of Navarre, who is principally known as the author of "*The Heptameron*," maintained a literary Court in which the most celebrated men of the time held high place. It was not until the middle of the sixteenth century that the great movement took place in French literature which, if that which occurred in the same country three hundred years subsequently be excepted, is without parallel in literary history.

The *Pléiade* consisted of a group of seven men who, animated by a sincere and intelligent love of their native language, banded themselves together to remodel it and its literary forms on the methods of the two great classical tongues and to reinforce it with new words from them. They were not actuated by any desire

for gain. In 1549 Jean Daurat, then 49 years of age, was professor of Greek at le Collège de Coqueret in Paris. Amongst those who attended his classes were five enthusiastic, ambitious youths whose ages varied from seventeen to twenty-four. They were Pierre de Ronsard, Joachim du Bellay, Remy Belleau, Antoine de Baïf, and Etienne Jodelle. They and their Professor associated themselves together and received as a colleague Pontus de Tyard, who was twenty-eight. They formed a band of seven renovators, to whom their countrymen applied the cognomen of the Pléiade, by which they will ever be known. Realising the defects and possibilities of their language, they recognised that by appropriations from the Greek and Latin languages, and from the melodious forms of the Italian poetry, they might reform its defects and develop its possibilities so completely that they could place at the service of great writers a vehicle for expression which would be the peer if not the superior of any language, classical or modern. It was a bold project for young men, some of whom were not out of their teens, to venture on. That they met with great success is beyond question; the extent of that success it is not necessary to discuss here. The main point to be emphasised is that it was a deliberate scheme, originated, directed, and matured by a group of little more than boys. The French Renaissance was not the result of a spontaneous bursting out on all sides of genius. It was wrought out with sheer hard work, entailing the mastering of foreign languages, and accompanied by devotion and without hope of pecuniary gain. The manifesto of the young band was written by Joachim de Bellay in 1549 and was entitled "La Defense et Illustration de la langue Francaise." In the following year appeared Ronsard's Ode—the first example of the new method. Pierre de Ronsard entered Court life when ten years old. In attendance

on French Ambassadors he visited Scotland and England, where he remained for some time. A severe illness resulted in permanent deafness and compelled him to abandon his profession, when he turned to literature. Although Du Bellay was the originator of the scheme, Ronsard became the director and the acknowledged leader of the band. His accomplishments place him in the first rank of the poets of the world. Reference would be out of place here to the movement which was after his death directed by Malherbe against Ronsard's reputation and fame as a poet and his eventual restoration by the disciples of Sainte Beuve and the followers of Hugo. It is desirable, however, to allude to other great Frenchmen whose labours contributed in other directions to promote the growth of French literature. Jean Calvin, a native of Noyon, in Picardy, had published in Latin in 1536, when only twenty-seven years of age, his greatest work, both from a literary and theological point of view, "The Institution of the Christian Religion," which would be accepted as the product of full maturity of intellect rather than the first fruits of the career of a youth. What the Pléiade had done to create a French language adequate for the highest expression of poetry Calvin did to enable facility in argument and discussion. A Latin scholar of the highest order, avoiding in his compositions a tendency to declamation, he developed a stateliness of phrase which was marked by clearness and simplicity. Théodore Beza, historian, translator and dramatist, was another contributor to the literature of this period. Jacques Amyot had commenced his translations from the Theagenes and Chariclea three years before Du Bellay's manifesto appeared. Montaigne, referring to his translation of Plutarch, accorded to him the palm over all French writers, not only for the simplicity and purity of his vocabulary,

in which he surpassed all others, but for his industry and depth of learning. In another field Michel Eyquem Sieur de Montaigne had arisen. His moral essays found a counterpart in the biographical essays of the Abbé de Brantôme. Agrippa D'Aubigné, prose writer, historian, and poet; Guillaume de Saluste du Bartas, the Protestant Ronsard whose works were more largely translated into English than those of any other French writer; Philippes Desportes and others might be mentioned as forming part of that brilliant circle of writers who had during a comparatively short period helped to achieve such a high position for the language and literature of France.

.

In 1576, when Francis Bacon arrived in France, the fame of the Pléiade was at its zenith. Du Bellay and Jodelle were dead, but the fruit of their labours and of those of their colleagues was evoking the admiration of their countrymen. The popularity of Ronsard, the prince of poets and the poet of princes, was without precedent. It is said that the King had placed beside his throne a state chair for Ronsard to occupy. Poets and men of letters were held in high esteem by their countrymen. In England for a gentleman to be amorous of any learned art was held to be discreditable and any proclivities in this direction had to be hidden under assumed names or the names of others. In France it was held to be discreditable for a gentleman not to be amorous of the learned arts. The young men of the Pléiade were all of good family and all came from cultured homes. Marguerite of Navarre had set the example of attracting poets and writers to her Court and according honours to them on account of their achievements. The kings of France had adopted a similar attitude. During the same period in England Henry VIII., Mary and Elizabeth had been fol-

lowing other courses. They had given no encouragement to the pursuit of literature. Notwithstanding the repetition by historians of the assertion that the good Queen Bess was a munificent patron of men of letters, literature flourished in her reign in spite of her action and not by its aid.

What must have been the effect on the mind of this brilliant young Englishman, Francis Bacon, when he entered into this literary atmosphere so different from that of the Court which he had left behind him? There was hardly a classical writer the works of whom he had not read and re-read. He was familiar with the teachings of the schoolmen; imbued with a deep religious spirit he had mastered the principles of their faiths and the subtleties of their disputations. The intricacies of the known systems of philosophies had been laid bare before his penetrating intellect. With the mysteries of mathematics and numbers he was familiar. What had been discovered in astronomy, alchemy and astrology he had absorbed; however technical might be a subject he had mastered its details. In architecture the works of Vitruvius had been not merely read but criticised with the skill of an expert. Medicine, surgery—every subject—he had made himself master of. In fact, when he asserted that he had taken all knowledge to be his province he spoke advisedly and with a basis of truth which has never yet been recognised. The youth of seventeen who possessed the intellect, the brain and the memory which jointly produced the "*Novum Organum*," whose mind was so abnormal that the artist painting his portrait was impelled to place round it "the significant words," "*si tabula daretur digna, animum mallet*," who had taken all knowledge to be his province, was capable of any achievement of the Admirable Crichton. And this youth it was who in 1576 passed from a country

of literary and intellectual torpor into the brilliancy of the companionship of Pierre de Ronsard and his associates. It is one of the most stupendous factors in his life. Something happened to him before his return to England which affected the whole of his future life. It may be considered a wild assertion to make, but the time will come when its truth will be proved, that "The Anatomie of the Minde," "Beautiful Blossoms," and "The French Academy," are the product of one mind, and that same mind produced the "Arte of English Poesie," "The Defense of Poetry," by Sir John Harrington, and "The Defense of Poetry," by Sir Philip Sydney. The former three were written before 1578 and place the philosopher before the poet; the latter three were written after 1580 and place the poet — the creator — before the philosopher. Francis Bacon had recognised that the highest achievement was the act of creation. Henceforth he lived to create.

Sir Nicholas Bacon died on or about the 17th of February, 1578—9. How or where this news reached Francis is not recorded, but on the 20th of the following March he left Paris for England, after a stay of two and a-half years on the Continent. He brought with him to the Queen a despatch from Sir Amias Paulet, in which he was spoken of as being "of great hope, endued with many and singular parts," and one who, "if God gave him life, would prove a very able and sufficient subject to do her Highness good and acceptable service."^{*}

Sir Amias Paulet's belief in Bacon's career of usefulness to the Queen proved ill-founded if the record of his acknowledged doings contain a full account of them. The matters of State in which he was concerned were trivial and few. He was persistently repressed, and up

^{*} State Paper Office ; French Correspondence.

to the death of the Queen he had never held office, nor do his great capabilities appear to have been recognized.

There is no mention of his arrival in England. Rawley states that on his return he found that his father had died without making any provision for him, and adds, "by which means he lived in some straits and necessities during his younger years." The next known reference to him is the letter of the 11th of July, 1580, to Mr. Doyley, and then follow the letters to Lord and Lady Burleigh, both written on the 16th of September, 1580, after he had been in England about eighteen months. It was during this period that the English Renaissance had its birth. It may be said to date from the publication of "The Lives of the noble Grecians and Romans . . . translated . . . out of French into Englishe," by T. North. This was a translation of Plutarch's Lives, not made from the original but from the French translation of Amyot. There are minor works which need not now be mentioned, but which bear evidence either of Francis Bacon's authorship or collaboration. Every book, whether in Latin or English, which was published during this period should be carefully compared, with special attention to the Dedication, Preface, or lines *To the Reader* in each.

William Cecil was a man of considerable classical attainments, although these were inferior to those of Mildred Cooke, the lady who became his second wife. He was initiated into the methods of statesmanship at an early age by his father, Richard Cecil, Master of the Robes to Henry VIII. Having found favour with Somerset, the Protector of Edward VI., he was, when 27 years of age, made Master of Requests. When Somerset fell from power in 1549 young Cecil, with other adherents of the Protector, was committed to the Tower. But he was soon released and was rapidly advanced by Northumberland. He became Secretary

of State, was knighted and made a member of the Privy Council. Mary would have continued his employment in office had he not refused her offers on account of his adhesion to the Protestant faith. He mingled during her reign with men of all parties and his moderation and cautious conduct carried him through that period without mishap. On Elizabeth's accession he was the first member sworn upon the Privy Council, and he continued during the remainder of his life her principal Minister of State. Sagacious, deliberate in thought and character, tolerant, a man of peace and compromise, he became the mainstay of the Queen's government and the most influential man in State affairs. Whilst he maintained a princely magnificence in his affairs, his private life was pure, gentle and generous. This was the man to whom the brilliant young nephew of his wife and the son of his old friend, Sir Nicholas Bacon, disclosed, some time during the summer of 1580, his scheme, of which there had been no experience, and entrusted his suit, which was rare and unaccustomed. The arguments in its favour at this interview may have followed the following outline:—

I need not remind you of my devotion to learning. You know that from my earliest boyhood I have followed a course of study which has embraced all subjects. I have made myself acquainted with all knowledge which the world possesses. To enable me to do this I have mastered all languages in which books are written. During my recent visit to foreign lands, I have recognized how far my country falls behind others in language, and consequently in literature. Especially I would draw your attention to the remarkable advance which has been made in these matters in France during your lordship's lifetime. When I arrived there in 1576 I made myself master of the principles of the movement which had been carried through by Du Bellay,

Ronsard, and their confreres. They found their native language crude and lacking in gravity and art. First by obtaining a complete mastery of the Greek and Latin languages, as also of those of Italy and Spain, they prepared themselves for a study of the literatures of which those languages, with their idioms and peculiarities, form the basis. Having obtained this mastery they reconstructed their native language and have given their country a medium by which her great writers may express their thoughts and emotions. They have made it possible for their countrymen to rival the poets of ancient Greece and Rome. They and others have translated the literary treasures of those ancient countries into their own tongue, and thereby enabled their countrymen, who are not skilled in classical languages, to enjoy and profit by the works of antiquity. Your lordship knows well the deficiencies of the language of our England, the absence of any literature worthy of the name. In these respects the condition of affairs is far behind that which prevailed in France even before the great movement which Ronsard and Du Bellay initiated. I do not speak of Italy, which possesses a language melodious, facile, and rich, and a literature which can never die.

I know my own powers. I possess every qualification which will enable me to do for my native tongue what the Pléiade have done for theirs. I ask to be permitted to give to my country this great heritage. Others may serve her in the law, others may serve her in affairs of state, but your Lordship knows full well that there are none who could serve her in this respect as I could. You are not unmindful of the poorness of my estate. This work will not only entail a large outlay of money but it necessitates command of the greatest wits of the nation. This is my suit: that her majesty will graciously confer on me some office which will enable

me to control such literary resources and the services of such men as may be necessary for the accomplishment of this work ; further, that she may be pleased from time to time to make grants from the civil list to cover the cost of the work. Your Lordship knows full well what fame will ever attach to her Majesty and how glorious will be the memory of her reign if this great project be effected in it. Your Lordship knows this because you and her Ladyship, my aunt, are qualified by your attainments to appreciate its full value. My youth may be urged as an objection to my fitness for such a task, but your Lordship knows full well—none better—that my powers are not to be measured by my years. I am no vain promiser, but I am assured that I can accomplish all that I contemplate. The Queen will listen to your advice. My prayer to you therefore is that you will urge my suit, which, although rare and unaccustomed, may be granted if it receives your powerful support.

The suit was submitted to the Queen but without result. Probably it was not urged with a determination to obtain its acceptance in spite of any objections which might be raised by the Queen. Five years after, Bacon, still a suppliant, wrote to Walsingham : "I think the objection to my years will wear away with the length of my suit." Cautious Lord Burghley would give full weight to the force of this objection if it were advanced by the Queen. This boy, with his extraordinary abilities, had such novel and far-reaching ideas. He appeared to have no adequate reverence for his inferior superiors. On leaving Cambridge he had arrogantly condemned its cherished methods of imparting knowledge. Before power was placed in his hands the use he might make of it must be well weighed and considered. What effect might the advancement of Francis Bacon have on Robert Cecil's career ? Granted that the contentions of

the former were sound and the object desirable, should not this work be carried out by the Universities? Never leap until you know where you are going to alight was a proverb the soundness of which had been proved in Lord Burghley's experience. What might be the outcome if this rare and unaccustomed suit were granted? Better for the Queen, who, though slow to bestow favours, was always ready to encourage hopes, to follow her usual course. She might entertain the motion graciously and return a favourable answer and let it rest there. And so it did.

Then there was a happening which has remained unknown until now.

In the "*Reliquiæ Bodleianæ*," published in 1703, is a letter written without date by Thomas Bodley to Francis Bacon. This letter does not appear to have been known to Mallett, Montague, Dixon, Spedding, or any of Bacon's biographers. It had been lost sight of until the writer noticed it and reproduced it in *BACONIANA*.* In a note then prefixed to it it was assumed, from internal evidence, that the letter was written shortly after the 18th of December, 1577. This year, however, is found to be incorrect, for reasons which will be stated. The letter commences thus:—

"MY DEAR COUSIN,—According to your request in your letter (dated the 19th October at Orleans, I received here on the 18th of December) I have sent you by your merchant £30 sterling for your present supply and had sent you a greater sum, but that my extraordinary charge hath utterly unfurnished me. And now, cousin, though I will be no severe exactor of the account, either of your money or time, yet for the love I bear you, I am very desirous, both to satisfy myself, and your friends how you prosper in your travels, and how you find yourself bettered thereby either of knowledge of God or of the world, the rather, because the days you have already spent abroad, are now both sufficient to give you light, how to fix yourself and end

* Vol. VI., third series, page 40.

with counsel and accordingly to shape your course constantly with it."

Bodley then proceeds to give young Francis advice as to the manner in which he should pursue his travels, going into minute details as to what he should observe, how he should conduct his inquiries, how record his observations, etc.*

There are two palpable deductions to be drawn from it: (1) That Bacon was on a journey through *several* countries to obtain knowledge of their customs, laws, religion, military strength, shipping, and whatsoever concerneth pleasure or profit. There is a striking correspondence between Bodley's advice and the description of Bacon's travels found in the "Life" prefixed to "L'Histoire Naturelle." (2) That Bacon was being supported by Bodley and other of his friends, who desired him to keep a record of all that he observed and learnt, and to report from time to time as he progressed, and in return, said Bodley, "I will make you as liberal a return from myself and your friends here as I shall be able." This letter was written from England. When the letter was previously referred to in BACONIANA,† it was assumed that it was written during

* Spedding prints this letter (Vol. II. p. 16) commencing with the words, "Yet for the love I bear," to the end, with the exception of the last sentence, as a letter written probably by Bacon for Essex to send to the Earl of Rutland. He identifies it as "the letter which the compiler of Stephens' Catalogue took for a letter addressed by Bacon to Buckingham," which he says it could not be. The original is at Lambeth (MSS. 936, fo. 218). The seal remains, but the part of the last sheet which contained the signature on one side, and the superscription on the other, has been torn off. The letter commences, "*My good Lord,*" and ends, "*Your Lordship's in all duty to serve you.*" It would appear, therefore, that someone had access to Bodley's letter to Bacon, and, approving its contents, used the letter a second time.

† Third series, Vol. VI., page 40.

Bacon's first visit to France, 1576—1579. But there is a paragraph in Bodley's "Life," written by himself, which makes it clear that this could not be the case. He writes:—

"My resolution fully taken I departed out of England anno 1576 and continued very neare foure yeares abroad, and that in sundry parts of Italy, France, and Germany. A good while after my return to wit, in the yeare 1585 I was employed by the Queen," etc.

It appeared strange that Bodley and others should be providing Bacon with money for his travels, and requiring reports from him, whilst his father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, was alive and prosperous. No such difficulty now arises, for the letter, being sent from England, could not have been written between the date of Bacon's first departure for France in 1576 and his return on his father's death in 1579, for during the whole of that time Bodley was abroad. It is stated in it that Bacon wrote from Orleans a letter dated 19th October, the year not being given. This could not be in 1580, for Bacon wrote to Lord Burghley from Gray's Inn on the 18th October, 1580. Spedding commences the paragraph immediately following this letter by saying, "From this time we have no further news of Francis Bacon till the 5th of April, 1582," and although he does not reproduce the letter, he relies on a letter from Faunt to Anthony Bacon, to which that date is attributed in Birch's "Memorials," Vol. I. page 22. In it Faunt refers to having seen Anthony's mother and his brother Francis. Faunt left Paris for England on the 22nd March, 1582. This letter was written on the 15th of the following month, so no trace has been found of Francis being in England between 18th October, 1580, and 5th of April, 1582. Bodley's letter must, therefore, have been written in December, 1581, when Bacon was abroad making a journey

through several countries. From the foregoing facts it is impossible to form any other conclusion. Now for the first time this journey has been made known. There is a letter amongst the State papers in the Record Office dated February, 1581, written by Anthony Bacon to Lord Burghley, enclosing a note of advice and instructions for his brother Francis.* Anthony was an experienced traveller, and was then abroad. It sounds as though he was sending advice and instructions to his younger brother, who was about to start on travels through countries with which Anthony was familiar. If so, Francis would leave England early in March, 1581—that is, if he had not left before this letter was received by Burghley.

Having established beyond reasonable doubt the fact of this journey, a new and remarkable suggestion presents itself. Spedding, when dealing with the year 1582, prints "Notes on the State of Christendom," † with the following remarks :—

"If that paper of notes concerning 'The State of Europe' which was printed as Bacon's in the supplement to Stephens' second collection in 1734, reprinted by Mallet in 1760, and has been placed at the beginning of his political writings in all editions since 1563, be really of his composition, this is the period of his life to which it belongs. I must confess, however, that I am not satisfied with the evidence or authority upon which it appears to have been ascribed to him."

Stephens states that the Earl of Oxford placed in his hands some neglected manuscripts and loose papers to see whether any of the Lord Bacon's compositions lay concealed there and were fit for publication. He found some of them written, and others amended, with his lordship's own hand. He found certain of the

* I am indebted to my friend Mr. H. W. Hardie for this information.

† "Life and Letters," Vol. I., page 16

treatises had been published by him, and that others, certainly genuine, which had not, were fit to be transcribed if not divulged. Spedding states that he has little doubt that this paper on the state of Europe was among these manuscripts and loose papers, for the editor states that the supplementary pieces (of which this was one) were added from originals found among Stephens' papers. The original is now among the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum. Spedding thus describes it :—

“The Harleian MS. is a copy in an old hand, probably contemporary, but not Francis Bacon's. A few sentences have been inserted afterwards by the same hand, and two by another which is very like Anthony Bacon's ; none in Francis's. The blanks have all been filled up, but no words have been corrected, though it is obvious that in some places they stand in need of correction.

“Certain allusions to events then passing (which will be pointed out in their place) prove that the original paper was written, or at least completed, in the summer of 1582, at which time Francis Bacon was studying law in Gray's Inn, while Anthony was travelling in France in search of political intelligence and was in close correspondence with Nicholas Faunt, a secretary of Sir Francis Walsingham's, who had spent the previous year in France, Germany, Switzerland, and the north of Italy, on the same errand ; and was now living about the English Court, studying affairs at home, and collecting and arranging the observations which he had made abroad, ‘having already recovered all his writings and books which he had left behind him in Italy and in Frankfort’ (see Birch's ‘Memoirs,’ I. 24), and it is remembered that if this paper belonged to Anthony Bacon, it would naturally descend at his death to Francis and so remain among his manuscripts, where it is supposed to have been found.

“Thus it appears that the external evidence justifies no inference as to the authorship, and the only question is whether the *style* can be considered conclusive. To me it certainly is not. But as this is a point upon which the reader should be allowed to judge for himself, and as the paper is interesting in

itself and historically valuable and has always passed for Bacon's, it is here printed from the original though (to distinguish it from his undoubted compositions) in a smaller type."

Spedding's difficulty in accepting this paper as from Bacon's pen really lay in the fact that from the internal evidence it is obvious that it was written by one who had himself travelled through at any rate some of the countries described. The results of personal observation are again and again apparent. According to Spedding, Bacon was in 1581—1582 studying law at Gray's Inn; according to Bodley he was on the Continent making observations for his future guidance. The reader can judge of the value of the external evidence. It is not conclusive, but the draft being found amongst papers which were unquestionably his writings and being adopted as Bacon's and published as such by those who found it, the balance of probabilities is distinctly in favour of its being his. As to the internal evidence much may be said. It corresponds as closely as it is possible with Bodley's requirements as set forth in his letter of December. It is exactly "the manner of return" Bodley told Francis "your friends expect from you." "And," he added, "if in this time of your liberal Traffick, you will give me any advertisement of your commodities in these kinds, I will make you as liberal a return from myself and your friends here as I shall be able."

The date agrees with that of Bacon's second visit to the Continent. In Spedding's *Life and Letters* it occupies twelve and a-half pages, of which five are occupied by descriptions of Italy, one of Austria, two of Germany (chiefly a recital of names and places), two of France, three-quarters of Spain, one and three-quarters of Portugal, Poland, Denmark, and Sweden. This may have been Bacon's itinerary in 1581—2.

Italy is treated with considerable detail and was

undoubtedly described from personal observation, as was France and Spain. In a less degree the description of Austria, Poland and Denmark produces this impression; in a still smaller degree Portugal and Sweden, and it is quite absent from the description of Germany. Florence, Venice, Mantua, Genoa, Savoy, are dealt with in most detail. Rawley states that it was Bacon's intention to have stayed abroad some years longer when he was called home by the death of his father, to find himself left in straightened circumstances. Then followed his ineffectual suit, which he still persisted in. Bodley evidently was, if not the instigator, at any rate the paymaster for this second journey. Anthony's letter of February, 1581, points to Burghley as a participator in the project. He would assist not only out of kindly feeling, but the journey would at any rate get this ambitious, determined young man out of the way for a time, and possibly the journey might get this unaccustomed suit out of his mind. Thus it came about.

From Faunt's letters, Spedding says we derive what little information we have with regard to Francis's proceedings from 1583 to 1584. "From them we gather little more than that he remained studying at Gray's Inn, occasionally visiting his mother at Gorhambury, or going with her to hear Travers at the Temple and occasionally appearing at the Court."

But the suit was not abandoned, for there is the letter of 25th August, 1585, to Walsingham, when Bacon writes: "I think the objection of my years will wear away with the length of my suit. The very stay doth in this respect concern me, because I am thereby hindered to take a course of practice which by the leave of God, if her Majesty like not of my suit, I must and will follow: not for any necessity of estate, but for my credit sake, which I know by living out of action will wear."

Again, the old, "rare and unaccustomed suit" of which the Queen could have had no experience! Either the persuasive powers of Burghley had failed or he had not exerted them. Probably the latter, because the troublesome, determined young man is now worrying Walsingham and Hatton to urge its acceptance with the Queen. The purport of the foregoing extract effectually precludes the possibility of this suit referring to his advancement at the bar. For five years it has been proceeding—he has been indulging in hopes which have been unfulfilled. Now he will wait no longer, but he will adopt a course which, if her Majesty like not his suit, by the leave of God he must and will follow, not for any necessity of making money but because he feels impelled to it by a sense of responsibility which he must fulfil. Walsingham and Hatton do not appear to have helped the matter forward. There was little probability of them succeeding in influencing the Queen where Burghley had failed. There was still less probability of their attempting to influence her if Burghley objected. Had this suit referred to advancement in the law it would have been granted with the aid of Burghley's influence years before. Had it referred to some ordinary office of State, friends so powerful as Burghley, Walsingham and Hatton could and would have obtained anything within reason for this brilliant young son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, for there was no complication with Essex until after 1591. But this rare and unaccustomed suit of which there had been no experience was another matter.

Six more years pass, and although there is now no suit to the Queen there is the same idea prevailing in the letter to Burghley—a seeking for help to achieve some great scheme upon which Bacon's mind was so fixed "as it cannot be removed," "whether it be curiosity, vain-glory or nature, or (if one take it favourably) philan-

thropia." Still he required the command of more wits than of a man's own, which is the thing he did greatly affect. Still his course was not to get. Still the determination to achieve the object without, if help could not be obtained—to achieve it by becoming some sorry book-maker or a pioneer in that mine of truth which Anaxagoras said lay so deep. This is emphasised. These are "thoughts rather than words, being set down without all art, disguising or reservation."

There are two significant sentences in this letter written to Burghley when Bacon was 31 years of age. He describes Burghley as "the second founder of my poor estate," and, further, he uses the expression "And if your Lordship will not carry me on." What can these allusions mean but that Burghley had been rendering financial assistance to his nephew? If the theory here put forward as to the nature of the suit be correct, the object was one which would have Burghley's cordial support. That he had expressed approval of it must be deduced from the letter of the 16th of September, 1580. The object was one which, without doubt, would find still warmer support from Lady Mildred. But the suit was so unprecedented that it is not to be wondered at that Burghley did not try to force it through. The work was going forward all the time—slowly for lack of means and official recognition. Burghley, generous in his nature, lavish in private life, might, however, be expected to help a work which he would be glad to see carried to a successful conclusion.

Had he been less cautious and let young Francis have his head, what might not have happened! But there was always the fear of letting this huge intellectual power forge ahead without restraint. It was, however, working out unseen its scheme and that, too, with Burghley's help and that of others. The period from 1576 to 1620—only 44 years—sees the English language developed

from a state of almost barbaric crudeness to the highest pitch which any language, classical or modern, has reached. There was but one workman living at that period who could have constructed that wonderful instrument and used it to produce such magnificent examples of its possibilities. It is as reasonable to take up a watch keeping perfect time and aver that the parts came together by accident, as to contend that the English language of the Authorised Version of the Bible and the works of Shakespeare were the result of a general upspringing of literary taste which was diffused amongst a few writers of very mediocre ability. The English Renaissance was conceived in France and born in England in 1579. It ran its course and attained its maturity in 1623; but when Francis Bacon was no more—he who had performed that in our tongue which may be preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome—"things daily fall, wits grow downward, and eloquence grows backward: so that he may be named and stand as the mark and ἀχμή of our language."

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

There will follow a further article in which an endeavour will be made to trace the manner in which Francis Bacon, without the aid of the Queen, successfully carried out his project.

FRANCIS BACON'S APPOINTMENT AS K.C.

THE rhetorical phrase of Pope appears to have so obsessed the minds of historians that they are unable to dissociate the character of Francis Bacon from all that is contemptible and mean. The bitterness of Lord Macaulay and Lord Campbell in their judgment of Bacon's character seems to have infected Sergeant Pulling, who makes strange allegations and insinuations in his work on the "Order of the Coif" against Bacon's conduct at the time of his appointment as King's Counsel.

According to this author, Francis Bacon was a man who "had an obscure university career," who "begged for promotion and office rather than work," who by improper solicitation and "unfair" favouritism was made a Bencher of his Inn, and by importunity—as if he was wholly undeserving—and even by fraudulent misrepresentation obtained promotion to the rank of King's Counsel and officer of the Crown.

Pulling was a sergeant, and his attacks against Bacon seem to be inspired by a grievance—that the latter was called within the Bar without being made a sergeant-at-law. Francis Bacon was the first King's Counsel in the modern sense of the term. In his time the practice in Court "within the Bar" was restricted to the officers of the Crown, *e.g.*, the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General and the Sergeants-at-Law ("Order of the Coif," p. 185). There were no other King's Counsel, with two exceptions, recognised in the Courts down to the 17th century. The judges were chosen from the sergeants, and sergeants alone were allowed to plead in the Court of Common Pleas, where actions relating to real property were tried. Bacon's appointment was

98 Francis Bacon's Appointment as K.C.

certainly an innovation, but let us see whether it deserves the strictures passed upon it.

Francis Bacon was called to the Bar in 1582, and by an order of the judges (1 Elizabeth) a barrister was precluded from practising in Court until he was of twelve years' standing ("History of Gray's Inn," p. 36). It seems clear from the congratulations of Lord Burleigh on the firstfruits of his public practice that Bacon's first case in Court was in 1594—twelve years after the date of his call (Spedding's "Life," Vol. I., p. 267).

During those twelve years Bacon was not only a briefless barrister, as we term it nowadays, but under the rigorous rules of the judges he was prevented from earning a living in his profession at the Bar. He was absolutely without means of his own, having inherited nothing from his father; and during his travels abroad, after his father's death, he was dependent on the maintenance he received from Bodley and his friends ("Reliquiæ Bodleianæ," CCXXXII.); while in later years he was obliged to borrow money for the necessities of life on security provided by his devoted brother, Anthony. It is a curious incident in the life of this remarkable man that, in spite of all his borrowings, Francis never lost the affection of his brother or his friends.

To such an active spirit the period of inaction was well-nigh intolerable. As the years went by, Francis voices his complaint to Walsingham in a letter which shows he was afraid that being out of action was injurious to his reputation. Almost in despair he writes to Burleigh suggesting he would retire from the legal profession and devote himself to literature (Spedding). Before resigning, however, he made a final effort. Being the son of a Lord Chancellor, as well as a distinguished Member of Parliament, and a man of

exceptional ability and learning, with considerable influence at Court, he made a request to Lord Burleigh to use his influence with the Queen to facilitate his being called "within the Bar" (Letter to Burleigh, 6th May, 1586; Spedding's "Life," Vol. I., p. 59).

The favour he asked—to be enabled to earn a living at his profession—was not extraordinary under the circumstances. The Queen, who was shrewd enough to realise the advantage of a prudent counsellor, was known to have a thrifty disposition; and instead of appointing Bacon a serjeant-at-law, with the annuity which was customary in those days, she promised that he should be engaged as one of her Majesty's extraordinary counsel—a vague appointment without patent or fee (Payment of Sergeants' "Accustomed Wages and Fees": Manning's "Servilus ad Legem," p. 192).

There is no doubt that, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Bacon did a great deal of work in the service of the Crown as legal counsel, unofficial Court secretary, and general adviser in affairs of State. He received no salary—there was no fixed scale of fees—and, so far as we know, the amount of his remuneration was not excessive. The Queen presented him with an estate at Richmond and the rectory of Cheltenham, and for his conduct of the prosecution in the Catesby case he received the sum of £1,200.

Upon the accession of King James, Bacon pointed out the anomaly of his position, and obtained his formal appointment as King's counsel by royal letters patent. Under the patent he was assured of an annuity of £40 a year, which, according to the value of money at that time, might be equivalent, perhaps, to the salary of a revising barrister at the present day.

Now let us compare these facts with the perversion of history in the "Order of the Coif."

Sergeant Pulling says : " Francis Bacon *after an obscure university career* began to keep terms in Grays Inn in 1578, and from all accounts the favours shown him were many and certainly not unsolicited. As soon as he was called to the Bar he was *pushed on to place and profit and unfair precedence in his Inn*, being made a Bencher at 26."

As regards the promotion at Grays Inn there was nothing unfair about it, and it is incorrect to say that at the age of 26 Bacon was what we now call a Bencher. A barrister in those days was promoted to the position of " Ancient," or member of the " Grand Company " ; then he was elected " Reader " and became a member of the Bench ; and after he had finished his Reading (or course of lectures) he was duly qualified as a Bencher and to take part in the proceedings of the governing body (" History of Grays Inn," p. 37).

Sons of judges or distinguished persons were made members of the " Grand Company of Ancients " as a matter of course ; and Francis Bacon, being the son of the Lord Keeper, who was also a Bencher of Grays Inn, had undoubted claims to this privilege. Without distinction of merit all the five sons of Sir Nicholas Bacon shared the same advantage by an order dated 21st November, 1577 (*Ibid*, p. 207). In 1586 Francis was placed at the Readers' table, but was not to gain precedence over Ancients nor be entitled to vote at the Pensions (*Ibid*). In 1588 he was Lent Reader, and having finished his reading he became fully qualified as a Bencher of his Inn.

So far from being a place of profit the position of Reader involved considerable expense, as he was expected to give great entertainments (*Ibid*, pp. 36, 37) ; but the office had certain advantages, such as a first claim to a vacant judgeship or the appointment of an officer of the Crown or sergeant-at-law.

Sergeant Pulling further alleges: "Francis Bacon, who after great importunity obtained from Queen Elizabeth the promise that he should be engaged as one of Her Majesty's extraordinary counsel, never set up that this was in any way a binding engagement or more than a post *honoris causa*. But after Elizabeth's death and James had become her successor, Bacon after much more importunity and solicitation (*and some adroit misrepresentation of what had taken place*) at last obtained his formal appointment from King James by letters patent. An annuity of forty pounds a year, by no means inconsiderable in those days, was reserved to the *impecunious philosopher* for his life."

At the time of this appointment King James gave Francis Bacon a pension of £60 per annum, which is stated in the document to be "*in consideration of good and faithful and acceptable service* by Francis and his half-brother Anthony Bacon." Yet Sergeant Pulling, who contemptuously refers to the "mercenary character of the arrangement with the Crown," states that this Royal grant was "*apparently made without consideration.*"

It is amusing to read Sergeant Pulling's sneers at the intellectual wonder of all ages—a man of almost super-human energy and industry, who toiled day and night for the benefit of mankind without hope of adequate reward or remuneration. The Sergeant says: "Bacon had already obtained the reversion to a sinecure office of £1,600 a year and hesitated not to beg for promotion and office *rather than work*, as others were obliged to do."

The reversion was granted in 1589, but it did not fall into possession till twenty years afterwards. "It is the fairest flower of my estate," wrote Bacon in 1597, "though it yet bear no fruit." And again, "It may mend my prospect but it does not fill my barn."

HAROLD HARDY.

BACON AS PLAYWRIGHT.

IN order to examine the claim of the biliteral cipher that Bacon wrote a large number of plays, some of which were title-paged to Peele, Marlowe, Greene and Shakespere pursuant to money bargains, it will be convenient to schedule these plays and a few others which have been, or may be, attributed to the same common authorship.

They are here set out in the order of printing :—

<i>Play.</i>	<i>Year Printed.</i>	<i>Ascribed Author.</i>
Arraignment of Paris ...	1584	Anon.
Tamburlaine, 1st and 2nd parts	1590	Anon.
King John (Troublesome Raigne)	1591	Anon.
Arden of Feversham ...	1592	Anon.
Edward I.	1593	Peele.
Dido	1594	Marlowe & Nash.
Looking Glass for England	1594	Greene & Lodge.
Massacre at Paris	1594	Marlowe.
Orlando Furioso	1594	Greene.
Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay	1594	Greene.
Spanish Tragedy	1594	Anon.
Battle of Alcazar	1594	Anon.
Selimus	1594	Anon.
Taming of a Shrew	1594	Anon.
Henry VI., part 2 (Contention)	1594	Anon.
Henry VI., part 3 (True Tragedie)	1594-5	Anon.
Cornelia (translation) ...	1594-5	Kyd.
Old Wives' Tale	1595	Peele.
Lochrine	1595	W. S.
Mucedorus	1595	Anon.
Edward III.	1596	Anon.
Romeo and Juliet	1597	Anon.
Richard II.	1597	Anon.
Richard III.	1597	Anon.

<i>Play.</i>	<i>Year Printed.</i>	<i>Ascribed Author.</i>
Edward II.	1598	Marlowe.
Henry IV., part 1	1598	Anon.
Henry V. (Famous Victories)	1598	Anon.
Love's Labour Lost	1598	Shakespeare.
James IV. of Scotland	1598	Greene.
David & Bathshebe (paraphrase)	1599	Peele.
Alphonsus King of Arragon	1599	Greene.
Pinner of Wakefield	1599	Anon.
Sir Clyomon	1599	Anon.
Henry IV., part 2	1600	Shakespeare.
Titus Andronicus	1600	Anon.
Much Ado about Nothing	1600	Shakespeare.
Merchant of Venice	1600	Shakespeare.
Midsummer Night's Dream	1600	Shakespeare.
Sir John Oldcastle	1600	Shakespeare.
Thomas Lord Cromwell	1602	Shakespeare.
Merry Wives of Windsor	1602	Shakespeare.
Hamlet	1603	Shakespeare.
King Leir	1605	Anon.
London Prodigal	1605	Shakespeare.
Puritan Widow	1607	W. S.
Yorkshire Tragedy	1608	Shakespeare.
Troilus and Cressida	1609	Shakespeare.
Pericles	1609	Shakespeare.
Sejanus	1616	Jonson.
Othello	1622	Shakespeare.
Two Gentlemen of Verona	1623	Shakespeare.
Comedy of Errors	1623	Shakespeare.
Twelfth Night	1623	Shakespeare.
As You Like It	1623	Shakespeare.
Julius Cæsar	1623	Shakespeare.
Measure for Measure	1623	Shakespeare.
Macbeth	1623	Shakespeare.
Anthony and Cleopatra	1623	Shakespeare.
Coriolanus	1623	Shakespeare.

<i>Play.</i>	<i>Year Printed.</i>	<i>Ascribed Author.</i>
Cymbeline	1623	Shakespeare.
Tempest	1623	Shakespeare.
Winter's Tale	1623	Shakespeare.
Timon of Athens	1623	Shakespeare.
Henry VIII.	1623	Shakespeare.
Henry VI., 1st part	1623	Shakespeare.
All's Well that Ends Well	1623	Shakespeare.
Jew of Malta	1633	Marlowe.

I make no pretension to literary or dramatic criticism. The object of this paper is merely to draw attention to circumstances which, I think, point to the truth of the cipher claim.

1.—None of the plays were printed in 1586, the year that Philip Sidney died of his wounds.

None were printed in 1588, when Robert Earl of Leicester died.

None were printed in 1601, when Robert Earl of Essex was put to death.

One play only was printed in 1603, the year of the death of Queen Elizabeth. It was *Hamlet*, the play said to be autobiographical, and it contained the celebrated soliloquy on suicide.

If the cipher story be true, as I am satisfied it is, Francis by the year 1603 had lost his cousin and great friend Sidney, his father the Earl of Leicester, his only brother Robert, and his mother the Queen, who died without openly acknowledging his relationship. Left alone in the world, no wonder that he asked himself the question, "To be or not to be?"

2.—Francis Bacon was a man of such method and overmastering prevision and precaution that it may reasonably be predicted that the ascription of his plays was not haphazard, but carefully schemed.

It was not until 1589 that, under the vizard of his

assistant Nash, in a preface to "Menaphon," he named Peele as author of the "Arraignment of Paris," printed anonymously in 1584.

Peele was the wayward son of the resident clerk to Christ's Hospital, who was forbidden from giving the son lodging at the hospital. He was a man-player or intermediary, and died in 1598 or earlier.

Greene was first one of the eight boys of the Chapel Royal Choir, who sang the masses and played in the interludes at Court. Sent as a poor boy to College he obtained on his return a post as assistant master over the Chapel boys, was afterwards given a benefice, then taken from it to act abroad as one of Earl of Leicester's men players in 1586, and died in the summer of 1592.

Francis seems to have employed and used him as mask for certain prose tales, and after Greene's death to have ascribed certain of his printed plays to Greene's authorship.

To return to Peele, the next use made of him was to affix his name as author to the end of the chronicle play of *Edward I.*, 1593. That was the year that Francis had through his speeches in Parliament incurred the Queen's displeasure and had been denied access to the Court. In 1594 a remarkable number of plays were printed. In that year Francis—still out of favour—was borrowing heavily, and at the same time pressing the Queen, through his brother Robert Earl of Essex and other influential courtiers, for the vacant office of Solicitor-General, and intimating that if refused he should retire with a couple of men to Cambridge or go abroad.

Note how carefully he dealt with the plays printed that year. Two were ascribed to the dead Greene, one to the dead Marlowe, another (*Dido*) as commenced by Marlowe and finished by Nash, and another (*Looking-glass for England*) as commenced by Marlowe and finished by Lodge. Five others were printed anonymously.

Marlowe was a man-player of sufficient scholarship to be employed copying in what would appear to have been Bacon's service for three years prior to his death (see Kyd's letter to Lord Puckering, 1593, printed in Boas' "Life of Kyd"). Kyd worked in the same chambers, but died before December, 1594.

The Christmas of 1594-5 found Francis truculent but unhappy. He prepared the device of a Mock Court for the Gray's Inn students' revels, but, according to the dedication of a week's work in translating Garnier's play of *Cornelie* for the Earl of Sussex's players, was very sorrowful. He title-paged the play to the deceased Kyd. During 1595 down to the end of 1597 the plays were mostly anonymous—Peele, who was alive, having one only of the plays ascribed to him.

4. The year, in Tudor times, ended upon the 25th March, and it was about January of 1597-8 that the trouble expected over the play of *Richard II.* caused Bacon to make terms with another player in the Queen's company, namely, Shakspeare, to act as mask, and go back to his village out of the way of inconvenient questioning. The newly-revised play of *Love's Labour Lost* was accordingly, in 1598, ascribed to Shakespeare, but the old play of *Henry V.*, performed before the Stratford actor's time, was printed anonymously. An early chronicle play, *Edward II.*, was debited to Marlowe, deceased; *Alphonsus King of Arragon* to Greene, deceased; and *David and Bathshebe* (1599), a play paraphrased from the Old Testament, was ascribed to Peele, then also deceased. The unascribed new play of *Henry IV.*, 1598, was ascribed to Shakespeare in the Mere's pamphlet, 1598, and title-paged to him in 1599; the others were anonymous.

5. I think it will be found that, to further confuse the issue of authorship, Francis under his masks of Nash and Greene, and in his assistant Meres' pamphlet, from

time to time covered up his proceedings in an inky cloud of allusions so as to make people believe that his puppets were really doing something.

6. From 1600 was fairly plain sailing, Francis using the Stratford player as vizard for his modern plays; but the very old plays, acted before the Stratfordian's time, namely, *Titus Andronicus* and *King Leir*, were printed anonymously in 1600 and 1605 respectively, and *Sejanus* was issued in the name of Bacon's friend and assistant, Jonson, who collaborated in it.

7. The epigram "Poet Ape," which Jonson printed in 1616, after Shakspeare's death, and which could only allude to the Stratford player, was simply printed as part of Bacon's scheme for confusing the authorship issue. The reason seems to be that the folio plays of 1623 must have been in long course of preparation and it had become expedient to account for old plays (performed and, in some cases, printed long before the name of the Stratford player was used as an authorship mask) being printed in the folio under his name. The suggestion in the epigram that he bought "the reversion of old plays" would thus be necessary to account for the new *Hamlet* (1603), new *King Lear* (1608), the *Pericles* (1609), and the intended inclusion of the old plays of *Comedy of Errors*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *King John*, *Henry V.*, two parts of *Henry VI.*, and *Titus Andronicus* in the 1623 folio Shakespeare.

8. Attention is drawn to the similarity of sources from which many of these plays, to whomsoever title-paged, were derived. A playwright of Bacon's wide learning and skill, of course, referred to a variety of exemplars in composing his plays, and made use of the works of both classical and modern authors. He drew material from a wide range of sources. Of plays from classical sources, there were the early play of *Spanish*

Tragedy from Seneca and Virgil, *Dido* from Virgil, *Comedy of Errors* (also an early play) from Plautus, *The Tempest* (a much later play) is also said to be founded upon Plautus, *Sejanus* upon Tacitus. From Spanish sources were *Tamburlaine* from Mexia, and *Two Gentlemen of Verona* from Montemayor. From German was *Dr. Faustus*, derived from the German book of the adventures of Dr. Johann Faustus. From Italian origins come a considerable number of plays, namely, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Orlando Furioso*, and *Much Ado about Nothing*, derived from Ariosto; *Romeo and Juliet* and *Twelfth Night* from Bandello; *James IV. of Scotland*, *Measure for Measure*, and *Othello* from Cinthio; *Merchant of Venice* and *Merry Wives of Windsor* from Ser Giovanni; *All's Well that Ends Well* and, to a certain extent, *Cymbeline* and *Troilus and Cressida* from Boccacio. From French sources were, of course, *Cornelia* from Garnier; *Hamlet* from Belleforest; *Anthony and Cleopatra* and *Julius Cæsar* from Amyot's Plutarch. From contemporary French sources came *The Massacre of Paris* and *Love's Labour Lost*, and from contemporary Spanish sources *The Battle of Alcazar*. Most of the English History plays were derived from authorities like Holinshed, Stowe, Fabian, and Froissart; *Macbeth* from Holinshed and Buchanan.

A few plays derived from English folk lore tales. Instances are *Pinner of Wakefield*, *Old Wives' Tale*, *As You Like It*, and *Friar Bacon*.

From Biblical sources were *David and Bathshebe* and *Looking-glass for England*.

Pericles, derived in part from Gower, *Troilus and Cressida* in part from Chaucer, and *Edward III.* in part from Bandello.

If Bacon did not go to the variety of sources shown, and which were well within his range, we have the remarkable difficulty that Marlowe, Greene, Peele, Kyd,

and Shakespeare, persons of humble origin, together with certain anonymous writers, all resorted to similar sources, and evinced a similar wide range of scholarship and travelled experience.

The cipher story of single authorship explains the mystery, otherwise inscrutable.

Francis Bacon, heir to the throne of the Tudor sovereigns, taught from early years to take wide views of men, of States, of Governments, and of literatures, drank abundantly of the spirit of the French Renaissance. Moving from success in minor dramatic writings he proceeded to lay

"Great bases for eternity."

His plays, confused as many are, though not materially injured, by the exigencies of his ciphers, particularly the word-cipher, must be considered as one great drama wherein he depicted for educational purposes the Pageant of Life in its greatnesses, its meannesses, its joys, follies, and other aspects.

It is the Drama of the Soul—its passions, sorrows, and aspirations. Delia Bacon, to her eternal honour, caught much of its meaning.

In constructing this drama, Francis did not omit the chorus. Sometimes as Nashe, again as Spenser, often as Greene, anon as Marlowe, as Meres, as Heywood, as Jonson, he illudes, confuses, comments, enjoins, or points a moral. Did he anticipate, I wonder, that in the universities of future ages learned clerks, misled by these devices, would fail to study his drama as a whole and, instead, dissect it in little bits, as they have done?

Yet most certainly they were warned—

"Fool! as if half eyes will not know a fleece

From locks of wool, or shreds from the whole piece."

—"Poet Ape."

PARKER WOODWARD.

MASSIVE FACTS.

A FEW days ago I received a letter from a very distinguished man, eminent both as a man of letters and as a naturalist, in which he stated some of the reasons why he could not accept the Baconian theory. The reasons which he gave were, all of them, matters of conjecture, for which no evidence existed; but he said that until these "massive facts" were disposed of there is no use in "peddling about details." I confess this astonished me; because no one, unless it be Darwin, has more industriously "peddled at details," *i.e.*, gathered together facts, large and small, to form an induction, than my distinguished correspondent. One of the most weighty of these "massive facts" was "the love and admiration which Shakspeare inspired in his fellow-actors and publishers." Of course this is mere guess work; not a scintilla of evidence exists for it. And so far as "publishers" is concerned it is a question-begging assumption; what is stated as fact is exactly that which is the matter in dispute. Shakspeare biography is for the most part constructed out of these conjectures, which are ticketed as "doubtless," or some equivalent phrase, and made the very foundation or corner-stones of a fictitious story. Baconian facts, on the contrary, are *not* guesses, but solid and substantial—not to be disputed; only interpreted.

This particular "massive fact" is remarkably contradicted by evidence which Mr. Spedding himself supplies. In Spedding's edition of Bacon's works, Vol. I., p. 519 (note), there is reference to a letter written by Lord Southampton to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere; and in quoting an extract from this letter, Mr. Spedding speaks of it as "that very letter without which we should hardly know that Shakspeare was personally known to anyone in the great world as a distinguished

dramatic writer . . . It proves at the same time how little was known about him by persons of that quality." Now it turns out that this same letter, instead of being written by Lord Southampton, was really written by Mr. Collier, and is one of the many forgeries which disgraced his otherwise valuable Shakespearean researches. Here, then, is the "massive fact" which my correspondent thought ought to supersede all the "peddling details" of the Baconian induction. Mr. Howard Staunton quotes this letter and several other documents as specimens of Mr. Collier's forgeries. See Staunton's "Shakespeare," Vol. I., p. lxi.

No one has more conclusively shown the poverty of fact out of which Shakspeare biography is constructed than our Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith. His words are so striking and his argument so vigorous that they deserve a permanent place in our annals. Mr. Asquith, speaking at Edinburgh, November 15th, 1901, said:—"Few things are more interesting to watch than the attempts of great scholars and critics, like Dowden and Brandon and Sidney Lee, to reconstruct the life of a man at once so illustrious and so obscure as the greatest of our poets. The case of Shakspeare presents, perhaps, the strongest array of difficulties and paradoxes in the whole range of biography. The most splendid genius of his own or any other time has left behind him, outside his writings, hardly a single undisputed trace of his personality. There has not been preserved so much as a single line in his own handwriting of any of his poems or plays. Such of the plays as were published in his life time seem to have been printed from stage copies, to a large extent by literary pirates. The apparently unbroken indifference of the greatest of all artists not only to posthumous fame, but to the safeguarding against defacement or loss of his own handiwork is without precedent or parallel. The date and order of his plays,

the identity of the 'only begotten' of the Sonnets, the manner in which his wealth was acquired, the literary unproductiveness of his last five years—he died at 52, the same age as Napoleon—his easy acquiescence in the sleepy humdrum, and the homely dissipations of social and civic life in a small provincial town—that all these questions and a hundred more should all be matters of conjecture and controversy is a unique fact in literary history. What else but this tantalizing twilight has made it possible for even the most distraught ingenuity to construct the great Baconian hypothesis—which by the way an accomplished critic has only this month so admirably capped by the counter theory, for which there is really as much to be said—that it was really Shakespeare who wrote the works of Bacon? The task which confronts the writer of a life like Shakespeare's is not to transcribe and verify a record; it is rather to solve a problem by the method of hypothesis and inference. His work is bound to be not so much an essay in biography in the strictest sense, as in the more or less scientific use of the biographic imagination. The difficulty is, of course, immensely enhanced, in this particular case, by the impersonal quality of most of Shakespeare's writings—a quality which I myself am heretic enough to believe extends to by far the greater part of the Sonnets. We do not know that the greatest teacher of antiquity wrote a single line. Shakespeare, who died less than 300 years ago, must have written well over a hundred thousand; and yet, thanks to Plato and Xenophon, we have a far more definite and vivid acquaintance with the man Socrates than we shall ever have with the man Shakespeare."

The "distraught ingenuity" which Mr. Asquith attributes to the Baconians, which we can easily forgive, is much more graphically described by himself in his account of the construction of Shakespeare biography.

Surely, in the view of such a crowd of "difficulties and paradoxes," the suggestion that the critics are on a wrong tack and must start afresh is not unreasonable. And the Baconian theory holds the field. The rival theory which Mr. Asquith treats so tenderly—that Shakespeare wrote Bacon's works—is too absurd to deserve the least argument. Perhaps the literary contortionist who started such a notion may be caught in his own trap and compelled to swallow whole the very notion, differently stated, which he considers so crushing. Such critical acrobats who seem to think it dignified to ride a race, face backward, on the margin of a donkey's tail, may be invited to take counsel of Sir Philip Sydney, who writes: "Marry! these pleasant fault-finders confute others' knowledge before they confirm their own. I would have them remember that scoffing cometh not of wisdom, so that the best title in true English which they get with their merriment is to be called GOOD FOOLS" ("Apology for Poetry").

It is interesting to see how easily the imputations of lunacy, monomania, ignorance, vanity, inability to test evidence, which lead on to delusion and deserving of free quarters at Colney Hatch, may be retorted and reversed when the case is dispassionately considered by a judicial and philosophical mind.

R. M. THEOBALD.

HOLO-FERNES ; HOLO-COMES.

THERE is a great possibility that sufficient attention has not been paid to the derivation of proper names in Shakespeare's Plays, with a view to ascertaining clues to the authorship. Of some there can be no possible misconception. Pistol, for example, appropriately fits that explosive filibuster, while Sir Toby Belch's peculiarities are referred to in the play, "A plague o' these pickle-herrings." There can be no doubt that the author selected appropriate cognomens for the creatures of his fancy, like so many writers have done, Dickens being a strong case in point ; therefore the striking similarity between "Holo-fernes" and "Holo-comes," together with collateral coincidences, justifies attention. Holofernes is a school-master in *Love's Labour Lost* who indulges in rhetoric in every-day life which manifests to all around his superior erudition. In neither word nor action does he justify his name if we suppose it to be derived from Holofernes the warrior.

Francis Bacon may or may not have attended St. Albans Grammar School ; according to a tradition long current in the town he certainly did so ; but I have no documentary evidence upon that point and only fragmentary lists of scholars at that early period. Certain it is that many of the Grimston family subsequently entered. The school is probably the most ancient in the kingdom, presumably founded by Abbot Ulsinus in the reign of Edred, but stated to have a still earlier origin in the recently-issued Inventory of Historical Monuments in Hertfordshire by the Royal Commission. A brief break in the continuity occurred at the Reformation, but King Edward VI. reinstated it in the Lady Chapel of the Abbey Church in 1553 by special charter, and in 1570 Sir Nicholas Bacon drew up the rules for

its governance, subsequently performing the same office for Harrow School. These rules are extant and possess considerable interest. The first Post-Reformation Headmaster was John Thomas Hylocomius, or Hylocomus, or Holocomus, or Holocomes, for by all these names he is referred to in contemporary and later documents. He was a native of Bois-le-Duc in Brabant, Netherlands, which name is rendered S'Hartogenbosch in Dutch. In St. Albans Abbey Register of burials we have Holocomus of "Sartacombust," evidently a corruption of S'Hartogenbosch. The date of his assuming the mastership is generally placed in 1588 upon the authority of a board in the school containing a so-called list of Post-Reformation masters; it was painted late in the 18th century and bristles with errors. Strange to say it has been recently repainted with all its inaccuracies uncorrected. John Thomas assumed the name of Hylocomius as referring to his birthplace, though "comius" can hardly be translated "duke." A James Wittewronge (progenitor of the present Sir Charles Lawes-Wittewronge, of Rothamsted, Harpenden, Herts) fled from Ghent to England in 1564. He sent his son Jacob to St. Albans Grammar School to be educated by his fellow-countryman; the youth left in 1576 and proceeded to Magdalen College, Oxford. These dates conclusively prove that Hylocomius was at the school many years before the reputed 1588. He died in 1596, though the board referred to states 1601.

If Francis Bacon attended the school he would have come under the tuition of Hylocomius; if he did not attend the name would still be well known to him by reason of the deep interest Sir Nicholas took in the foundation. The name of the latter, and that of the Lady Anne, occur among the principal benefactors to be prayed for daily in the school; while the library still preserves among its other treasures a Demosthenes

and a Plato presented by "Mr. Francis Bacon" in 1587, thereby showing his own personal interest in the school. Apart, however, from this evidence, which goes to prove that Hylocomius was personally known to Bacon, we glean from the records that the school-master was a well-known and extremely clever man, and successful in business, too, which is the more remarkable, considering his profession. One reference says, "Helicomius was preceptor, a man of great esteem for his abilities in that employment." The Mayor and Town Council, speaking of him, say, "Who his successor will be doth well concern the town as the country in general, and we have had and still enjoy a rare and singular jewel whereby the school hath flourished and become famous, and we hope yet long to enjoy him." Surely praise such as this places him far above the ordinary dominie. In the Abbey Church, above the south door of the Presbytery, is a spacious inscription to his memory written in 1625. It is in Latin and parts of it may be rendered thus: "This master, French, Irish, and Netherlander did court, to whom as eloquent proofs he gave the learned arts. Him doth cherish and everlastingly recollect an assembly of the British race as well-born as numerous." "In memory of the venerable John Thomas Hylocomius, of Bois le Duc in the Netherlands, formerly a munificent citizen of this town, and a most renowned school-master."

That the foregoing should not be classed with grandiloquent epitaphs of the period is proved from school registers. Although St. Albans had a population at that time of about 2,000, there entered the establishment between 1587 and 1596 no less than 220 scholars. In 1587 he gave two books to the library—a Pliny, value 30s., which has disappeared, and a Greek dictionary called Cornucopia, value 13s. 4d., still preserved.

If Francis Bacon, writing *Love's Labour Lost* at an early age, introduced a schoolmaster and cast about for a suitable name, that of Hylocomius or Holocomes would be fresh in his mind, and the probability that Holocomes suggested Holofernes may perhaps be admissible.

CHARLES H. ASHDOWN.

St. Albans.

BACON'S LOST MANUSCRIPTS.

THE review of Mrs. Gallup's last book of decipherings mentions nothing of the subject dealt with. If a review is to be of value at all, it should tell us somewhat of the new facts which the authoress believes herself to have discovered.

Instead, the reviewer has reverted to the question of whether Mrs. Gallup has ever discovered anything at all. He admits Mrs. Gallup's good faith and the honesty of those who confirm her deciphering. He writes as one who has studied and thinks he has become familiarized with every style of writing used by Bacon and the musical rhythm common to each. He believes that he knows the extent to which Bacon mastered, and used, the art of cipher-writing. What, then, are the preliminary difficulties which caused him to confine his review to the point of whether there is a biliteral cipher and to leave the new narrative alone?

1. He objects that the story is not written out in the old English spelling and language of the time, yet assures us that accuracy in the spelling of that period is an utter impossibility, as there was no definite standard.

Professor Skeat and other spelling reformers have recently shown that in that respect the Elizabethans were to be envied, as they wrote the spoken word in the

way it seemed to sound at the moment of writing. The reviewer thinks the practice gave Mrs. Gallup a very wide margin for irregularities. Yet it also increased the difficulties of decipherment. The reviewer should, if he could, have given instances of where the want of accuracy in the old English spelling helped to "illude" Mrs. Gallup. In its absence his first objection is academic and unreal.

2. Another of his points is that elision of letters is frequent in the cipher story, rare in most works of the period, and not to be found in Bacon's acknowledged writings. In cipher-writing, like the biliteral, one should expect frequency of elision, principally to economise space, often to correct mistakes, and often to discourage the casual decipherer.

The reviewer cannot have read Mrs. Gallup's patient, thorough and painstaking replies to her earlier critics published in book-form by Messrs. Gay and Bird. He might refer to page 158 and the specimen of elision on page 198 of that book.

3. The reviewer objects that the narrative is not in the main original, but follows in the beaten tracks of Dr. Ward Owen. Such an objection from a simple mind obsessed with the notion of plagiarism might pass. But the reviewer writes as one expert in Bacon's inductive method. A mind so trained should be prepared to find Bacon faithful to his aphorism that "truth can never be confirmed enough," and with that object conveyed his messages in duplicate by the medium of two different ciphers corroborative of each other.

4. But the unfamiliarity of the "style" causes the most perplexity to the reviewer. Bacon's musical style, he says, is not in the decipher. While I am not prepared to accept the general application of this comment, I would ask the reviewer whether Bacon has not more than once explained: "style is as the subject-matter."

"Faith thou wilt be caught by the style," said the Marprelate pamphleteer. Why should not this master of style have had at least one style more—one practically confined to biliteral cipher messages? Supposing Bacon had been found out and hauled up in his lifetime before your reviewer, or his Jacobean prototype, the absence of the musical rhythm would have saved his head.

The biliteral cipher style or non-style may have been a measure of additional precaution, or due to ciphering from memory.

"Men began to hunt more after words than matter; and more after the choiceness of the phrase and the round and clean composition of the sentence and the sweet falling of the clauses . . . than after the weight of matter, worth of subject, etc." ("Advancement of Learning").

Evidently, Bacon could dispense with rhythm if he so desired.

5. Assuming it to be a fact that from 1620 to 1680 the spelling of words was becoming more regular, the retention by old Bacon, old Rawley after him, and then old Sir William Dugdale, of the orthography of their youth cannot be a point against the authenticity of the decipher.

6. The reviewer seems to have concentrated his own efforts upon the ciphers devised by Bacon at the maturity of his intellectual powers. Yet in the brilliance of his youth, so eloquently testified by Hilliard, but as far as cipher-writing is concerned in his comparative immaturity, Bacon invented the biliteral cipher. It is adaptable to printer's type or to letters cut most carefully by a graver and to nothing else. It is more than plausible that in the enterprise and enthusiasm of youth Francis adventured to insert his biliteral cipher in printed books, whether passing under his own

ascription or that of others. Until the key was given this could have been done in absolute security.

Its presence would be the more easily concealed by the gradations of type irregularities to which the reviewer has referred.

Having placed his biliteral and a carefully distributed and fragmented "word" cipher in a series of early and late publications, a period arrived in Bacon's life when these narratives or messages would be lost unless he furnished the keys. In 1623 he was an old man, and from my considerable knowledge of the working of the "word" cipher I firmly believe that in the 1623 Folio Bacon did give sufficient direction to enable a keen investigator to arrive by inductive methods at the existence of the word cipher and the way it was to be deciphered. Further, that every credit is due to Dr. Ward Owen, who discovered it.

Fear lest his messages—which also included statements of his having used other ciphers—should be lost, constrained Francis Bacon to give, not to the world but to a few possible students of a future age, the key by which the biliteral story might be unlocked, and incidentally the important announcement made that other ciphers were awaiting discovery. This he did in a seemingly casual and yet very complete way in the "De Augmentis" of 1623. Such a proceeding was only a natural evolution of his scheme, and, if there were a risk, he had reached a time of life and a period of his career when he could take it. This man was no coward. His main work was finished, his health declining, his incursion into the region of "Great Place" disastrously terminated.

On the "illusion" assumption it is remarkable that Mrs. Gallup should be found "illuding" herself with decipherings recording these fears and resolves on Bacon's part.

8. I agree that Bacon intended his more matured cipher messages to be reached by inductive methods, and believe that he planned to reward those who had the perception, ability and persistence to pierce the veil of these cipher secrets. In doing so they proved his great educational argument of the value of inductive methods.

9. The reviewer calls for more confirmation of the biliteral cipher system. Who, I should like to know, can be expected, at his own expense, to waste half a lifetime in the work of confirming a discovery no longer new, no longer fascinating, no longer offering a chance of reward—nothing but insult? Other researchers in the cipher field are only kept going by the hope of important or rewarding discovery. Moreover, investigation of the biliteral cipher system is no simple matter.

A correspondent of the *Times* in December, 1901, and January, 1902, after an *exhaustive* examination, only found eleven capitals in two distinct italic forms in the First Folio and other books about that date. The late Mr. Bompas, after what appeared to him an equally *exhaustive* examination, found fifteen italic capitals in the double form, but the *Times* correspondent identified the letters B.D.P. and R., which Mr. Bompas could not, while he identified Q.U.Y. and T., which the correspondent failed at. Of the six unidentified letters in biform two were X and Z. Not every brain is sensitive to slight differences of form. It will not register them even when magnified. To obtain the full confirmation asked by your reviewer, a large number of investigators must begin and continuously persist. Even then a small percentage only will perceive.

10. For progression in this investigation a little more tolerance and patience is needed and less of the attitude of a certain Oxford Professor, satirised in these lines:—

"What there is to know I know it.
And what I don't know isn't knowledge."

The reviewer presses for such confirmation as only a paid Government Commission could give.

Such as he would wait for further expeditions to the North Pole to confirm Commander Peary as to the nature of the land or water there, yet when their confirmatory reports were received might still mutter:—"These statements are not original. They follow in beaten tracks."

Of confirmation of the deciphered story there is an amplitude. Quite recently a member of our Society drew attention to an old book, published in Latin in 1621, in English in 1628, and—*mirabile dictu*!—with a clavis at the end of it. Its title is "John Barclay his Argenis." Working with the clavis, Mr. Cuninghame found the book to be an avowed admixture of history and fable, which stated that Queen Elizabeth married one of her chief subjects, and that a son born to them courted the daughter of a king of France.

This is corroboration of the cipher story of the love of Francis for Marguerite.

If not, we have to make the utterly unlikely assumption that Mrs. Gallup, before she deciphered, read the "Argenis," 1628—a rare book,—mastered the indications of its clavis, ascertained from French sources the possible lady, and then "illuded" herself that certain passionate, poetical, and beautiful passages concerning Marguerite were really being revealed in biformed italic type in some of the books she deciphered!

Mrs. Gallup, too, must have read Nichol's "Progresses of Elizabeth," and "illuded" herself that when the dying Queen Elizabeth, in reply to her Ministers of State (who wished to know her pleasure as to who should succeed to the throne), said, "I will have no

rascall to succeed me," the Queen was referring to her son, Francis Bacon.

If Robert Earl of Essex, beheaded in February, 1600-1, was another son of the Queen, he would have been justified in thinking himself of Tudor pedigree.

Prior to his death he was confined in the Beauchamp Tower. Did he or did some friend cut in deep, large letters—still to be seen—over the doorway of the small cell there the name "Robart Tidir"? Or was it carved by one of the Pilgrim Fathers, and did a long-preserved record of the act eventually reach Mrs. Gallup in Detroit, so as to cause her to "illude" herself with the notion that Robert was also a son of the Queen?

Gentle reviewer, accept the well-meant advice of one who, for many years, has studied evidence corroborative of the truth of the biliteral cipher story. Be not as the less gentle reviewers and scribes.

Though they broaden their phylacteries, the demon of truth cannot be kept away for all time; as time will demonstrate.

HERMES.

[By the courtesy of the Editor I have been afforded an opportunity of perusing the foregoing article. Hermes' points Nos. 1, 2 and 3 require no reply. The observations referred to were directed against the statement of Mrs. Gallup's publisher, which was quoted at length. Hermes' remarks confirm the contention that the publisher's statement was inaccurate. Nos. 4 and 5 do not help the case for Mrs. Gallup. Edwin A. Abbot writes,* "Few men have shewn equal versatility in adapting their language to the slightest shade of circumstance and purpose. His style depended upon whether he was addressing a king, or a great nobleman, or a philosopher, or a friend; whether he was composing a State paper, pleading in a State trial, magnifying the prerogative, extolling truth, discussing studies, exhorting a judge, sending a New Year's present, or sounding a trumpet to prepare the way for the Kingdom of Man over Nature." Bacon

9 ° "Francis Bacon," by Edwin A. Abbot, 1885, page 447.

had other styles of which Abbot knew nothing. But in all that he wrote there was a "style." In the decipherings there is none. The suggestion that "the Biliteral cipher style may have been simply a measure of additional precaution" cannot be entertained. "Precaution" which could only produce effect after the decipherer had done her work implies that Bacon desired to throw doubt on his cypher message. No. 6, Bacon did not invent the biliteral cypher. He simply took it from Porta and Vigenère. With the writings of both Bacon was familiar. It is a clumsy and impracticable cypher. No one who knows anything of Bacon's methods of working would admit that he would make use of a cypher and publish the key. Such a course would violate the fundamental principle of his inductive method. No. 8 does traverse any portion of the *Review*. No. 9 emphasises the weakness of the case for the biliteral cypher. The same letter is printed in different forms in half, if not more, of the books published in England from the introduction of printing until the eighteenth century. That is accepted; but Hermes apparently admits that no one but Mrs. Gallup can be found to confirm her publisher's statement that "the italic letters in all the sixty odd original editions as translated, fitting 'in groups of five,' according to the biliteral system of Bacon, as found in *De Augmentis* and arranged with such precision that every letter—some of them are easily differentiated—should uniformly and accurately be found in its place as 'a' font or 'b' font." If such uniformity and accuracy exists it should be possible for any ordinary person to confirm them. No. 10, If Hermes correctly reports the discovery of Mr. Cuninghame, it would appear that he has made a serious error. Hermes, no doubt, refers to Hyanishe as representing Queen Elizabeth. Hyanishe had no son. Her sister Anna had been married to King Meleander, who went abroad after their marriage. Anna died in giving birth to a son whilst he was away. Hyanishe, on the dying request of her sister, adopted the son and determined to keep his birth a secret from Meleander until she "had first made trial whether he would grow worthy of so great a father." Meleander married again and had a daughter, Argenis, who is said to represent Margaret of Navarre. Eventually Hyanishe restored her nephew Arcombrotus to his father. If this is the sort of confirmation upon which upholders of the biliteral cypher story rely, well! this is the sort of confirmation upon which they rely. This is the "demon of truth" with a vengeance. —[THE REVIEWER.]

REVIEWS

The Vindication of Shakespeare. A Reply to Critics, together with some remarks on Dr. Wallace's "New Shakespeare Discoveries." By G. G. Greenwood, M.P., author of "The Shakespeare Problem Restated." London: Sweeting & Co., 4, Dyers Buildings, Holborn Bars, E.C.

PERHAPS this book is the strongest attack which has been made on the Shakspeare title. In it Mr. Greenwood replies to criticisms which were levelled against the position he took up in his former work, "The Shakespeare Problem Restated." These criticisms were contained in articles which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* by Sir Edward Sullivan and the Rev. Canon Beeching, and in the *Library* by the former. There is also a chapter dealing with an article from the pen of Rose G. Kingsley on "Shakespeare in Warwickshire," another on Dr. Wallace's "New Shakespeare Discoveries," and a note on "The Name Shakespeare."

Mr. Greenwood is a skilled controversialist. He handles Sir Edward Sullivan and Canon Beeching with a thoroughness which leaves nothing to be desired. He asks no quarter and he gives none. Inaccuracies and misrepresentations are exposed, fallacious arguments are riddled, and he leaves his opponents so completely discomfited that one can hardly help feeling pity for them. Mr. Greenwood shows a complete mastery of the arguments both for and against the Shakspeare authorship, and the book is a valuable arsenal for all who are called upon at times to defend the claim of the controversy for a rational hearing. Of especial value in this respect is the chapter dealing with "Shakespeare and Warwickshire," in which the true facts are stated as to many untenable hypotheses which are reiterated by Stratfordian advocates. Mr. Greenwood not only makes clear the little value there is in Dr. Wallace's discoveries, but the effect of his examination proves that such additional evidence as they afford rather strengthens than weakens the case against Shakspeare being the author of the plays.

The note on "The Name Shakespeare" summarizes what has been said in the controversy on the spelling of the name and on the handwriting of the signatures. Mr. Greenwood disagrees with Magdalene Thum-Kintzel and Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence as to the Will being in the same handwriting as the signatures. The question of whether Shakspeare signed his name or not to the Blackfriars Deeds and the Will may never be cleared up, but before long the fact will be definitely established that the words, *William Shakespeare*, represent the most extraordinary combination of letters in the language and that they have no connection with the name of the Stratford player. Mr. Greenwood's forcible style of writing makes the book most pleasant reading and will be warmly appreciated by all who are interested in the subject with which it deals.

The Connection of Francis Bacon in the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays and with the Books on Cypher of his time. By Charles P. Bowditch. The University Press, Cambridge, U.S.A.

THIS book deals chiefly with the title-page and illustrations of the "Cryptomenytices," by Gustavus Selenus. It contains fourteen plates of excellent reproductions; nine of these are from this work. There are also portraits of the Abbe Johannes Trithemus and of Bacon. It is stated that when Mr. Walden translated the "Cryptomenytices," those for whom he undertook the work were so impressed with the importance of knowing all they could about the work and its author that they requested Mr. Walden to go to Europe and to make full enquiry at Wolfenbuttel, which was for a long time the residence of the Duke of Brunswick and where his library still exists. He found there amongst the manuscripts certain correspondence between the Duke and an agent of his named Hainhofer on the subject of the production of the plates for illustrating the work. Extracts from the letters which passed are given.

Mr. Bowditch endeavours to show the existence of cypher signatures and sentences in *Love's Labour's Lost*, but in this he is by no means convincing.

The Droeshout Portrait of William Shakespeare. An experiment in identification, with thirty-one illustrations by William Stone Booth. Boston: W. A. Butterfield.

THIS is a valuable contribution to the controversial literature. Mr. Booth has already published two remarkable books,^o revealing cypher signatures in books published during the period of Bacon's literary activity.

Anyone who will devote the time and application requisite to master these two books (and they require much of both, as all decyphering does) will come to the conclusion that the evidence produced establishes the case put forward by the author. Now, Mr. Booth submits another theory still more startling. The letterpress occupies only slightly more than four pages, the main points of which are these: with the exception of the drawing of the bust on the Stratford monument made by or for Sir William Dugdale, probably about 1636, the only portrait of the poet known as William Shakespeare which can be unreservedly accepted is the engraving by Martin Droeshout, placed as a frontispiece to the 1623 Folio edition of his plays. Is this portrait intended to represent the face of Francis Bacon? The characteristic lines of a face constitute a definite linear pattern precisely as do the lines of finger and thumb prints, and the method adopted for identification is like that which is pursued by the

^o "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon," Constable & Co., 1909. "The Hidden Signatures of Francesco Colonna and Francis Bacon," Constable & Co., 1910.

police authorities in their use of finger prints, or Bertillon measurements in the identification of criminals. Colouring, beard, hair or wig may change; teeth may fall out; cheeks may sag with age; temples may become hollow; but the underlying bone structure of the face remains unchanged throughout the life of an adult, while its fleshy covering tends to expose its foundation as time passes. Essentially the same method as that adopted by Mr. Booth is applied by Professor R. J. Holbrook in "*Portraits of Dante from Giotto to Raffael*" in determining the origin of various portraits of Dante. Four portraits are taken into consideration: (1) the Droeshout engraving; (2) the engraving of Sir Francis Bacon when Lord Keeper, signed by Simon Passe; (3) Marshall's portrait of Lord Verulam, prefixed to the 1640 "*Advancement of Learning*"; (4) the portrait of Lord Verulam, assigned to Van Somers. These portraits are then reduced so that the distance between each pair of eyes is the same as between each other pair. The Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare is then shown in combinations with the three portraits of Bacon, as to leave no reasonable doubt that both were derived from one and the same personality. The objection may be raised that there are many men the anatomy of whose faces is closely alike. Such likenesses happen every day, and moreover in these four portraits the pose is conventional. This is met by admitting that any two men may look alike, but the point is that the portraits of the two greatest men of Elizabethan times are found to be anatomically identical. What the motives may be for so careful a mystification is secondary if there be proof that the deed was done. Then follow twenty-seven composite portraits, in which the Droeshout engraving is taken as the base. With great skill and care portions of the Bacon portraits are overlaid, giving results which are astonishing as proofs of identity. The volume is beautifully printed and produced. It can be seen at the Bacon Society's rooms.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Will you allow me a word on Mr. R. M. Theobald's article headed "*Omnes Numeros Habet*" in BACONIANA for October last? When Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence says, "He who hath filled up all numbers means, unquestionably, He that hath written every kind of poetry," he is, *me judice*, unquestionably wrong. To fill up all numbers is simply a rendering of *Omnes numeros explere*, which means "to be perfect." In Bacon's case it is, I have no doubt, perfection in literary production to which Jonson alludes. Mr. Theobald does well to quote the late Dean Plumptre in illustration of the meaning of the Latin expression which Jonson characteristically employs, but I can

cite two passages from a work to which the Dean, if he had read it, possibly did not care to refer. In the *Satyricon* of Petronius Arbiter we read of a young slave that, "*duo vitia habet, quæ si non haberet, esset omnium numerum.*" Again, in the same work, a beautiful youth is described as "*Margaritum, egregius, et omnium numerum.*" In both these instances the words *omnium numerum* simply indicate perfection. I may add that Jonson had certainly read Petronius, for he has (though I do not think this has been noticed) left a verse rendering of his lines *De vera voluptate*.

I would like to add a word as to the reference to Bacon on the second (misnumbered) page 53 of the 1640 edition of the "Advancement of Learning." Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence says, "We read in the margin S. FRAN. BACON," which is true; but we read more than that, for the word "Apol" is also there. What is the meaning of this? In the passage to which these words are the marginal note Bacon tells us that it was said of Henry Duke of Guise "that he was the greatest usurer in all France, because that all his wealth was in names, and that he had turned his whole estate into obligations." Now if the reader will turn to Bacon's Apology for the Earl of Essex, he will read how, when the Queen had refused Essex's request of the post of Solicitor-General for Bacon, the Earl said to him (Bacon), "I die if I do not somewhat towards your fortune; you shall not deny to accept a piece of land which I will bestow upon you." Whereupon Bacon answers "that his lordship's offer made me call to mind what was wont to be said, when I was in France, of the duke of Guise, that he was the greatest usurer in France, because he had turned all his estate into obligations: meaning that he had left himself nothing, but only had bound numbers of persons to him." This marginal note, therefore, is nothing more than a reference to Bacon's apology for Essex. It is true that in the Apology it is not actually said of the Duke of Guise, *totidem verbis*, that "all his wealth was in names," and I believe there are some who attach a mystic significance to those words, as though they were intended to conceal—or to reveal—an allusion to a polyonymous Bacon; but the expression is perfectly natural and intelligible as applied to the Duke of Guise, and to seek a cryptic meaning in it seems to me (I trust I may be forgiven for saying so) not a little fantastic. But then it is pointed out that "S. Fran. Bacon" is printed in capital letters, and much importance is attributed to that fact. Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence says that these are "almost the only marginal capital letters in the whole of the book," but inspection will show that this is not so. We have, for instance, "Jacobus R." in capitals at page 73, and "K. James" at page 82, and it seems to me as natural for Bacon, in making reference to one of his own works, to print his name in capital letters as it was for him so to print the name of King James. At page 95 we have "Hen. VII.," "Hen. VIII.," "Ed. VI.," and "Maria Elisa," all in capitals, and we have, in fact, a large number of other instances of "marginal capital

letters" in the book, though not, certainly, of personal names. The fact remains, of course, that we have Bacon's name mentioned on a misnumbered page 53, for what that is worth, but when we remember that the book is one of Bacon's own authorship, published in his own name, and that the reference is to another such work, I cannot think that fact is worth very much.

Yours faithfully,

DIGAMMA.

November 2nd, 1910.

Portia.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

THE writer recently bought from an old bookshop in London a play in Italian, entitled *La Cognata*, described on the title-page as a very facetious and new comedy by M. Nicolo Tani. It was printed by Paulo Mieto at Padua in 1583, and must be rare, as it is not in the British Museum. Amongst the *dramatis personæ* is "Portia." Her part is a minor one but noteworthy. She is the fair young daughter of a noble Roman doctor, M. Pirro Salaci, whose wife has been carried away in the sack of Rome, in 1527. That he may be free to go in search of her, he entrusts Portia to the care of a friend who takes her to Florence, but on disturbances arising there sends her, dressed in male attire, to Sienna, where she lives as a student. She is, however, betrothed to one Claudio, of Florence. There are many other characters in the comedy and the ingenious plot consists of their complicated cross love affairs. Although Portia plays no advocate's part it is possible that the name and her rôle as a male student suggested to the author of the *Merchant of Venice* the "learned young doctor of Rome" whom old Bellario sent from Padua, to the discomfiture of Shylock. As "Shakespeare" was, according to the simple orthodox, rendered omniscient by his genius, he "no doubt" knew not only Italian but *La Cognata*. Some free-thinkers may, however, fancy that Anthony Bacon, who was abroad when the comedy appeared, sent it to his brother in England.

It is worth mentioning that there is another "Portia" in the "Shakespeare" plays, viz., the wife of Brutus in *Julius Cæsar*, and she was "excellently well scene in philosophie," as North says in his rendering of Plutarch's "Life of Brutus."

J. R., of Gray's Inn.

"To Fill Up All Numbers."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

WILL you allow me to return (somewhat late in the day) to the subject treated of by Dr. R. M. Theobald in your issue of October last, under the heading "Omnes Numeros Habet"? In

that article uncomplimentary allusion is made to some remarks of mine which had been quoted by Sir E. D. Lawrence in his book "Bacon is Shakespeare." In reality Sir E. D. Lawrence's printer has misused inverted commas, and Dr. Theobald has been misled into quite misunderstanding me. I will ask you, therefore, to be so kind as to give me space for a complete and accurate statement of my text, which represents the opinion I still hold as to the question at issue. I wrote:—

"After Shakespeare's death Jonson had written of him :

' When thy socks were on
Leave thee alone for the comparison
Of all that insolent Greece or haughty Rome
Sent forth, or since did from their ashes come.' "

Now after Bacon's death Jonson writes of him : "He hath filled up all numbers and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome." Jonson was not a man usually short of words, and it is odd, unquestionably, that he should give to the world two panegyrics so similarly worded on two persons apparently so different, and whom he knew so well as the Chancellor and the Player.

Still more, however, has been made by Baconian advocates of the fact that the panegyric bestowed on the Chancellor should seem of the two the one better fitted for the Player. For, "to fill up all numbers," said of Bacon, seems a natural expression of praise only for a poet. "Numeri" in Latin, "numbers" in English applied to literature mean nothing else than verse, and even seem to exclude prose. Thus Tibullus writes : "Numeris ille, hic pede libero scribit" (One writes in verse, another in prose). And Shakespeare has the same antithesis in *Love's Labour Lost* (iv. 3) : "These numbers I will tear and write in prose." Yet all this does not settle the matter. For "numeri" is also used in the sense merely of "parts." Pliny speaks of a prose work as perfect in all its parts : "Omnibus numeris absolutus." And Cicero says of a plan of life : "Omnes numeros virtutis continet" (it contains every element of virtue). So that Jonson may have merely meant to say in slightly pedantic phrase that Bacon had passed away, "all parts fulfilled," the expression actually used by Pope in ironic praise of Queen Caroline.

Yours faithfully, GEORGE O'NEILL, M.A.

University College, Dublin, March 13th, 1911.

The Duplex Shakespeare.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The following paragraph respecting "The Duplex Shakespeare," which appeared in the *Westminster Gazette* on the 21st inst., might, I think, interest some of your readers. We have all

heard of the "duplex" lamp with two wicks, but quite apart from any "duplicity" that may be apparent in this matter, we may rest assured that William Shakspeare was merely the "unpolished vessel" out of which Bacon poured his nectar.

"THE DUPLEX SHAKESPEARE."

"The following extract from the *Yorkshire Post* (a correspondent writes), although it may not convert the Baconians, throws such a flood of light on the discrepancy existing between the life of Shakespeare and his works that it seems worth preserving, especially by readers not destitute of a sense of humour:—

"An interesting lecture on Shakespeare was given at Leeds last night by Miss Morden Grey. Dividing her lecture into two parts—Shakespeare, the man, and Shakespeare, the genius—Miss Grey contrasted the absolute distinction between the two. As a man, Shakespeare was a cute man of business, successful, and, upon retiring, he bought property. She was of opinion that he was totally unaware of his own great genius, which ran from him as nectar might run from an unpolished vessel. The works of almost every other poet were in themselves a revelation of the writer, but this was not so in the case of Shakespeare. A hasty summary of his life showed it to be most unpoetical and delightfully commonplace."

"The picture of the poet as an 'unpolished vessel' from which his 'genius' ran like nectar, is surely decidedly novel."

It is quite certain that no "unpolished" writer could have written *Love's Labour's Lost* or the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

Yours faithfully, AMBROSE T. PEYTON.

Sir Herbert Tree's Revelation.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

The account of this extraordinary revelation requires a short introduction:—

Some 30 to 40 years ago there existed an English school at the small village of Neuenheim, which has now become a suburb of Heidelberg. The headmaster of this school (since deceased) was an English clergyman, Armitage by name, an accomplished scholar, universally beloved and respected, being in touch with the prominent leading celebrities of his day. In the summer of 1883, *f.i.*, Edward Arber, the Birmingham professor, was his guest for some weeks. I remember with pleasure this vivacious gentleman, to whom I gave German lessons. Through my recommendation his reprints and "The Transcript of Registers" were then acquired by the Heidelberg University Library. Later on, the Armitage school came into the possession of a Dr. Klose, after whose retirement it reverted to the sons of Mr. Armitage. They

left the management of the school in the hands of Mr. H., who, report says, was not exactly a total abstainer. Then the Armitage School, or Neuenheim College as it came to be called, began to decline, whilst another English school, under the able management of Dr. Holzberg, took its place and is now the leading school for English boys at Heidelberg. The Neuenheim College ended with an unfortunate law suit, in consequence of which some towns' people lost considerable sums of money.

Now, the former pupils of Neuenheim College, the "Old Neuenheimers," many of whom are reported to occupy important positions in various walks of life, gratefully remember the pleasant time of their Heidelberg days and are in the habit of reviving the memory of their youthful jollifications by annual dinners. This year's dinner was solemnized at the Trocadero, London, and an "amusing" address by Sir Herbert Tree was there read. I really do not know in what relationship he stands to the N. C., or whether perhaps he is an "Old Neuenheimer" himself. The *Daily Mail*, January 9th, 1911, reports about it:—

"An amusing address by Sir Herbert Tree (who was prevented from being present personally) was read at the 'Old Neuenheimers' dinner at the Trocadero, London, on Saturday night, in proposing the toast of the evening. After alluding to the success of many 'Old Neuenheimers' in various walks of life, he went on:

"Let me be personal for a minute. Twenty-one years ago I presented my first Shakespearean revival, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and from then until now Shakespeare has been a good friend to me. I suppose in Neuenheim to-day they talk of Shakespeare, as I heard him talked of when I was in Berlin some time ago, as 'unser Shakespeare.' I conclude it was a Neuenheimer who, in the fifteenth century, emigrated to England from the little village of Neuenheim. His name was Schweinfleish; but in spite of his name I believe he was of Jewish extraction. He changed his name to Bacon and wrote those works which, though they are of German origin, have been none the less successful in the land of his adoption. And let it be remembered we have an excellent translation by Shakespeare.

"One day I hope to give a performance of *Hamlet*, by 'unser Shakespeare,' in German, for I can still repeat 'Sein oder nicht sein'; but I shall only give it in the Elysian Fields, where I believe the German language is exclusively spoken.

"Certainly there is some excuse for the Germans, because our English Shakespeare has become the glories of German dramatic literature. I wonder whether in any German household an incident might have occurred which happened recently in London. I recall being in a drawing-room where my proposed revival of *Macbeth* was being discussed. My host inquired who would play Autolycus. I replied that this character would not appear in my representation; and with a smile the enthusiast remarked: 'You would sacrifice anything to gorgeous scenery.'"

All this, no doubt, was meant to be "amusing," a merry "Bier-rede" (an after-dinner or beer speech), as we say in Germany. But what an ugly after-taste of stale beer is there in this address! It was apparently meant to hold up to ridicule a certain Neuenheimer who has been endeavouring for these last six or seven years to elucidate the Bacon problem in all sincerity. The most serious obstacle in the propounding of this most fascinating problem is the fact that in England, as elsewhere, people, far from being aware of the vital importance of this controversy, instead of taking the pains to study it seriously, are in the habit of turning it into ridicule, of laughing at it. They do not appear to realize how much is at stake in this investigation for a true understanding of Shakespeare, in the first place, for England at large and for the whole world in general. For Shakespeare really is "the one to whom all scenes of Europe homage owe, who was not of an age, but for all time." These scoffers appear to be quite unable to realize the importance of *determining the personality* of the "immortal bard" or "world's poet"; whether he was the money-grubbing Will Shakspeare whose biographers have, in spite of all their endeavours up to those of Professor Wallace, entirely failed to find a scrap of proof that he was even moderately educated, and able to write his name, or whether he was the greatest man that lived in the sixteenth century—Francis Bacon. The story of his life has been mangled and crippled by his biographers, who gave only the smaller half, or one-third, of his life. It is a pity that English people should have been all the while blind to this fact, and that "their blind affection (to Shakspr), in seeliest ignorance, does ne'er advance, but really gropes and urgeth all by chance," as Ben Jonson says.

And now for one of the foremost exponents of Shakespeare, Sir Herbert Tree, who informs us that "*one Bacon*" lived in the *fifteenth* (!) century. Was this also meant for a joke, or was it said in earnest? This is the point—you never know where the joking finishes and where seriousness begins. It is this would-be irony, or rather "humourous fraud," which has become the curse and canker of our age.

Well, let us assume that Sir Herbert said it in all seriousness. Then, as I take it, we must blame his reporters and the Editor of the *Daily Mail*. Was it not their duty to correct such a flagrant chronological error in their report? Or we must ask, What do English people, even educated people, know about Bacon? Did not one of these merry Neuenheimers or their reporter take notice of such a blunder and take the trouble to look up the name in a book of reference?

Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree may be excused, in a way, as he is no genuine Englishman. People say that he is of German extraction, and there are those that draw other inferences.

Poor Bacon! poor Shakespeare! didst thou feel the possibility of such a disgrace when, on the 9th of April, 1626, thou didst write in thy testament and last will the following lines: "For my

name and memory, I leave it to men's charitable speeches, to foreign nations and the next ages."

I sincerely hope that I shall not be misinterpreted, and that what I have said will not be attributed to sordid motives, or feelings of personal dislike. Such was not my intention. I am actuated solely by a feeling of duty towards the great author whom I worship and whose fair name I feel it my privilege to protect and to defend whenever assailed, so far as lies in my power. I am a humble but enthusiastic follower of Bacon's exalted principles and sublime precepts. And "to mitigate the justice of the plea," I will rather think that the *fifteenth* century was a slip of the pen that wrote it, or of the tongue that read it. It is my intention to send these lines, when printed, to Sir Herbert Tree and ask him whether he seriously meant to write the *fifteenth* century. And perhaps he will have the kindness to explain, preferably in BACONIANA, what he really meant to imply when he said, Shakespeare "nostras."

G. HOLZER.

Heidelberg, January, 1911.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—The latest theory, or revelation about our "good Queen Bess" must have come upon all good Baconians as a great shock; for though many secrets have dimly played round that imperious Sovereign the most bewildering secret of all has been kept to the last, namely, that our Virgin Queen, who loved admiration and indulged in many flirtations, *was a man!* Mr. Bram Stoker has certainly added to the gaiety of nations by solemnly bringing many facts to light to show that Elizabeth was a "famous impostor,"* for it now appears the young Princess died when ten years old, and that her nurse dressed up a boy who much resembled her to take her place. Henry VIII. was either deceived or let the fraud pass, and he allowed *her* or *him* to grow up without indulging in his favourite pastime of cutting off a head. And thus the masculine intellect, which historians have praised, is accounted for.

But turning to Baconian theories, one trembles to think what Mrs. Gallup must have suffered, with others of her following, on hearing that the mother of Francis Bacon was a man! Mr. Bram Stoker is really too cruel, and he cannot have properly considered the ruin he was creating, for if Elizabeth was of the masculine persuasion down go Mrs. Gallup, Dr. Orville Owen, and other lusty Baconians; and their various books and essays and cypher stories can be consigned to the flames. It is enough to break up any literary Society, and if Bacon discussions and arguments are more heated than ever in the future, it is not to be wondered at, and it is entirely Mr. Bram Stoker's fault. But

* "Famous Impostors," by Bram Stoker (Sedgwick and Jackson).

our admiration for Queen, or rather King, Elizabeth grows while contemplating his shrewdness, for not only did he manage by the aid of flirtations with Leicester, Essex and others to impress people with his feminine sex, but he also gains our unqualified admiration for the way he managed his *shaving arrangements*.

They evidently did those things better in the good old times, and of course if King Elizabeth's barber had shown any astonishment over the Queen's growth of hair on her chin he would have been headless with his own razor immediately. Or did the Queen shave herself? No wonder Essex was furious at the box on the ears he received. Perhaps it came "straight from the shoulder" with masculine strength. But think how the poor King must have been irritated by the tightness of those awful corsets which drew his waist down into a point. It is not astonishing he let out, though it was dangerous considering the strain on the laces and buttons. How he must have laughed at his gullible subjects, and how grateful he must have been to Raleigh for introducing tobacco. We can imagine the Queen taking a few whiffs in private. "Odds Bodkins! let Parliament wait till I finish this pipe." Of course it was hard that marriage was out of the question, and that he had to flirt with a man and not with a woman always; but you can't have everything. It is to be hoped that the authorities of Westminster Abbey will have the inscription on the grand tomb of Elizabeth altered. Her manly qualities should be brought to the front, and a gentle hint given as to her sex. It can still run in old Latin, which nobody understands. I really think Baconians of Mrs. Gallup's way of thinking should have bribed Mr. Bram Stoker to suppress his book that has given heartaches to so many, but which has been a source of unfeigned amusement to your

PUZZLED BACONIAN.

NOTE.

A MEMBER of the Bacon Society, desirous of encouraging research work among his fellow-members, has offered to give a gold medal, or as an alternative, books to the value of £6, to be awarded by the Council to the member who in their opinion has during the year made the most important discovery of documents bearing upon the controversy as to the authorship of the Shakespeare plays or a kindred subject, and a silver medal or badge to the member considered second in merit. Members of the Council are not eligible for these awards. Further particulars may be obtained on application to the Secretary.

TO FRANCIS BACON

(On the 350th Anniversary of his Birth).

BORN in an age when Learning's lamp—untrimmed
 By any hands since mighty Rome's decay—
 Shone with enfeebled light, its lenses dimmed
 By clouds of ignorance, unbroken, gray ;
 Great Verulam, thy hand filled it once more
 With radiance, which flashes now from shore to shore.

For without thee and thy directing mind—
 Which, seeking wisdom from all sources known,
 With insight ne'er at fault, first taught mankind
 The only path to Truth's eternal throne—
 Where now would be the science which we boast,
 And the broad Pharos light which gleams from coast to coast ?

Yet are there some, to their eternal shame,
 Who would this truth ungratefully forget,
 Or worse, in sheer malignity revile thy name
 (As he who, conscious of thy greatness, yet
 Must call thee "mean" to whom all gold was "dirt")
 And label thee "corrupt," whose judgments no man hurt !

Yet, spite of these and of the thoughtless crew
 Who shout in chorus, ign'rantly misled,
 Thy name in time shall have its honour due—
The first of Englishmen, alive or dead—
 Thy name, surpassing great as England's Seer,
 But greater, nobler still, as England's true "Shake-speare."

For from the hand of Pallas did'st thou take,
 When she resigned her seat, her glorious lance,
 Which, in her rage divine, she wont to shake
 Against the face of trembling Ignorance,
 And with it wrought such deeds as not e'en she
 Performed when armed in Jove's majestic panoply.

Yet, not content on earth her part to play,
 With daring hand thou took'st Apollo's lute,
 And from it drew such strains—grave, tender, gay—
 As ne'er proceeded yet from earthly flute,
 Wedding the while to glorious Poesy,
 The form, rejuvenate, of old Philosophy.

Immortal Genius, on this day to thee
 My homage here I bring—these lines of mine—
 To greet thy birth—unworthy though they be—
 To greet thy birth and lay them on thy shrine,
 O'er which, some time, shall gleam thy natal star,
 As that o'er Bethlehem once, to lead men from afar.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.